



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



DA

30

G796

1882











**HISTORY**  
**OF THE**  
**ENGLISH PEOPLE**

**BY**  
**JOHN RICHARD GREEN, M.A.**

**IN FIVE VOLUMES**

**VOLUME III.**

---

**NEW YORK**  
**THE USEFUL KNOWLEDGE PUBLISHING COMPANY**  
**JOHN B. ALDEN, BUSINESS AGENT**  
**1882**

## PUBLISHER'S NOTICE.

---

It will be observed that in this edition of "Green's History of the English People," the paragraphs are numbered. The object of this numbering is to secure convenience of consultation in connection with the "World's Index of Knowledge," the references in that work applying equally to this and to the "Model Octavo" edition, and to the paragraphs instead of to the page's which has been customary.

# CONTENTS.

---

## BOOK VI.


### THE REFORMATION. 1540-1603.

CHAPTER	PAGE
AUTHORITIES FOR BOOK VI.....	5
I.—THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION. 1540-1553.....	9
II.—THE CATHOLIC REACTION. 1553-1558.....	66
III.—THE ENGLAND OF ELIZABETH. 1558-1561.....	133
IV.—ENGLAND AND MARY STUART. 1561-1567.....	174
V.—ENGLAND AND PAPACY. 1567-1582.....	230
VI.—ENGLAND AND SPAIN. 1582-1593.....	288
VII.—THE ENGLAND OF SHAKESPEARE. 1593-1603.....	333

## BOOK VII.

### PURITAN ENGLAND. 1603-1660.

AUTHORITIES FOR BOOK VII.....	393
I.—ENGLAND AND PURITANISM. 1603-1660.....	396
II.—THE KING OF SCOTS... ..	436
III.—THE BREAK WITH THE PARLIAMENT. 1603-1611.....	459



# THE ENGLISH PEOPLE.

---

## BOOK VI.

---

### THE REFORMATION.

(1540-1603.)

#### AUTHORITIES FOR BOOK VI.

603. FOR the close of Henry the Eighth's reign, as for the reigns of Edward and Mary, we possess copious materials. Strype covers this period in his "memorial," and in his lives of Crammer, Cheke, and Smith; Hayward's "Life of Edward the Sixth" may be supplemented by the young king's own journal; "Machyn's Diary" gives us the aspect of affairs as they presented themselves to a common Englishman, while Holinshed is near enough to serve as a contemporary authority. The troubled period of the protectorate is illustrated by Mr. Tytler in the correspondence which he has published in his "England under Edward the Sixth and Mary," while much light is thrown on its close by Mr. Nicholls in the "Chronicle of Queen Jane," published by the Camden society. In spite of countless errors, of Puritan prejudices, and some deliberate suppressions of the truth, its mass of facts and wonderful charm of style will always give importance to the "Acts

and Monuments" or "Book of Martyrs" of John Foxe, as a record of the Marian persecution. Among outer observers, the Venetian Soranzo throws some light on the protectorate; and the dispatches of Giovanni Michiel, published by Mr. Friedmann, give us a new insight into the events of Mary's reign.

604. For the succeeding reign we have a valuable contemporary account in Camden's "Life of Elizabeth." The "Annals" of Sir John Hayward refer to the first four years of the queen's rule. Its political and diplomatic side is only now being fully unveiled in the calendar of state papers for this period, which are being issued by the master of the rolls, and fresh light has yet to be looked for from the Cecil papers and the documents at Simancas, some of which are embodied in the history of this reign by Mr. Froude. Among the published materials for this time we have the Burleigh papers, the Sidney papers, the Sadler state papers, much correspondence in the Hardwicke state papers, the letters published by Mr. Wright in his "Elizabeth and Her Times," the collections of Murdin, the Egerton papers, the "Letters of Elizabeth and James the Sixth" published by Mr. Bruce. Harrington's "Nugæ Antiquæ" contain some details of value. Among foreign materials as yet published the "Papiers d'Etat" of Cardinal Granvelle and the series of French dispatches published by M. Teulet are among the more important. Mr. Motley, in his "Rise of the Dutch Republic" and "History of the United Netherlands," has used the

state papers of the countries concerned in this struggle to pour a flood of new light on the diplomacy and outer policy of Burleigh and his mistress. His wide and independent research among the same class of documents gives almost an original value to Ranke's treatment of this period in his English history. The earlier religious changes in Scotland have been painted with wonderful energy, and on the whole with truthfulness, by Knox himself in his "History of the Reformation." Among the contemporary materials for the history of Mary Stuart we have the well-known works of Buchanan and Leslie, Labanoff's "Lettres et Mémoires de Marie Stuart," the correspondence appended to Mignet's biography, Stevenson's "Illustrations of the "Life of Queen Mary," Melville's memoirs, and the collections of Keith and Anderson.

605. For the religious history of Elizabeth's reign Strype, as usual, gives us copious details in his "Annals," his lives of Parker, Grindal, and Whitgift. Some light is thrown on the queen's earlier steps by the Zürich letters, published by the Parker society. The strife with the later Puritans can only be judged fairly after reading the Martin Marprelate tracts, which have been reprinted by Mr. Maskell, who has given a short abstract of the more important in his "History of the Martin Marprelate Controversy." Her policy toward the Catholics is set out in Burleigh's tract, "The Execution of Justice in England, not for Religion, but for Treason," which was answered by Allen in his "Defense of the English Catholics." On the actual working of the penal

laws much new information has been given us in the series of contemporary narratives published by Father Morris under the title of "The Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers;" the general history of the Catholics may be found in the work of Dodd; and the sufferings of the Jesuits in More's "*Historn Provinciæ Anglicanæ Societatis Jesu*." To these may be added Mr. Simpson's biography of Campion. For our constitutional history during Elizabeth's reign we have D'Ewe's journals and Townsend's "*Journal of Parliamentary Proceedings from 1580 to 1601*," the first detailed account we possess of the proceedings of the house of commons. Macpherson in his annals of commerce gives details of the wonderful expansion of English trade during this period, and Hackluyt's collection of voyages tells of its wonderful activity. Amid a crowd of biographers, whose number marks the new importance of individual life and action at the time, we may note as embodying information elsewhere inaccessible the lives of Hatton and Davison by Sir Harris Nicolas, the three accounts of Raleigh by Oldys, Tytler, and Mr. Edwards, the lives of the two Devereux, Earls of Essex, Mr. Spedding's "*Life of Bacon*," and Barrow's "*Life of Sir Francis Drake*."

**CHAPTER I.**

**THE PROTESTANT REVOLUTION.**

1540—1553.

606. At the death of Cromwell the success of his policy was complete. The monarchy had reached the height of its power. The old liberties of England lay prostrate at the feet of the king. The lords were cowed and spiritless; the house of commons was filled with the creatures of the court and degraded into an engine of tyranny. Royal proclamations were taking the place of parliamentary legislation; royal benevolences were encroaching more and more on the right of parliamentary taxation. Justice was prostituted in the ordinary courts to the royal will, while the boundless and arbitrary powers of the royal council were gradually superseding the slower processes of the common law. The religious changes had thrown an almost sacred character over the "majesty" of the king. Henry was the head of the church. From the primate to the meanest deacon every minister of it derived from him his sole right to exercise spiritual powers. The voice of its preachers was the echo of his will. He alone could define orthodoxy or declare heresy. The forms of its worship and belief were changed and rechanged at the royal caprice. Half of its wealth went to swell the royal treasury, and the other half lay at the king's mercy. It was this unprecedented concentration of all power in the hands of a sin-

gle man that overawed the imagination of Henry's subjects. He was regarded as something high above the laws which govern common men. The voices of statesmen and priests extolled his wisdom and authority as more than human. The parliament itself rose and bowed to the vacant throne when his name was mentioned. An absolute devotion to his person replaced the old loyalty to the law. When the primate of the English church described the chief merit of Cromwell, it was by asserting that he loved the king "no less than he loved God."

607. It was, indeed, Cromwell who more than any man had reared this fabric of king-worship. But he had hardly reared it when it began to give way. The very success of his measures, indeed, brought about the ruin of his policy. One of the most striking features of Cromwell's system had been his development of parliamentary action. The great assembly which the monarchy had dreaded and silenced from the days of Edward the Fourth to the days of Wolsey had been called to the front again at the cardinal's fall. Proud of his popularity, and conscious of his people's sympathy with him in his protest against a foreign jurisdiction, Henry set aside the policy of the crown to deal a heavier blow at the papacy. Both the parties represented in the ministry that followed Wolsey welcomed the change, for the nobles represented by Norfolk and the men of the new learning represented by More regarded parliament with the same favor. More, indeed, in significant though almost exaggerated phrases set its omnipotence face to face with the

growing despotism of the crown. The policy of Cromwell fell in with this revival of the two houses. The daring of his temper led him not to dread and suppress national institutions, but to seize them and master them, and to turn them into means of enhancing the royal power. As he saw in the church a means of raising the king into the spiritual ruler of the faith and consciences of his people, so he saw in the parliament a means of shrouding the boldest aggressions of the monarchy under the veil of popular assent, and of giving to the most ruthless acts of despotism the stamp and semblance of law. He saw nothing to fear in a house of lords whose nobles cowered helpless before the might of the crown, and whose spiritual members his policy was degrading into mere tools of the royal will. Nor could he find anything to dread in a house of commons which was crowded with members directly or indirectly nominated by the royal council. With a parliament such as this, Cromwell might well trust to make the nation itself, through its very representatives, an accomplice in the work of absolutism.

608. His trust seemed more than justified by the conduct of the houses. It was by parliamentary statutes that the church was prostrated at the feet of the monarchy. It was by bills of attainder that great nobles were brought to the block. It was under constitutional forms that freedom was gagged with new treasons and oaths and questionings. One of the first bills of Cromwell's parliaments freed Henry from the need of paying his debts, one of the last gave his proclamations the force of laws. In the

action of the two houses the crown seemed to have discovered a means of carrying its power into regions from which a bare despotism has often had to shrink. Henry might have dared single-handed to break with Rome or to send Sir Thomas More to the block. But without parliament to back him, he could hardly have ventured on such an enormous confiscation of property as was involved in the suppression of the monasteries or on such changes in the national religion as were brought about by the ten articles and the six. It was this discovery of the use to which the houses could be turned that accounts for the immense development of their powers, the immense widening of their range of action, which they owe to Cromwell. Now that the great engine was at his own command, he used it as it had never been used before. Instead of rare and short assemblies of parliament, England saw it gathered year after year. All the jealousy with which the crown had watched its older encroachments on the prerogative was set aside. Matters which had, even in the days of their greatest influence, been scrupulously withheld from the cognizance of the houses, were now absolutely forced on their attention. It was by parliament that England was torn from the great body of western Christendom. It was by parliamentary enactment that the English church was reft of its older liberties and made absolutely subservient to the crown. It was a parliamentary statute that defined the very faith and religion of the land. The vastest confiscation of landed property which England had ever witnessed was wrought by parliament. It regulated the suc-

cession to the throne. It decided on the validity of the king's marriages and the legitimacy of the king's children. Former sovereigns had struggled against the claim of the houses to meddle with the royal ministers or with members of the royal household. Now parliament was called on by the king himself to attain his ministers and his queens.

609. The fearlessness and completeness of such a policy as this brings home to us more than any other of his plans the genius of Cromwell. But its success depended wholly on the absolute servility of parliament to the will of the crown, and Cromwell's own action made the continuance of such a servility impossible. The part which the houses were to play in after years shows the importance of clinging to the forms of constitutional freedom, even when their life is all but lost. In the inevitable reaction against tyranny they furnish centers for the reviving energies of the people, while the returning tide of liberty is enabled through their preservation to flow quietly and naturally along its traditional channels. And even before Cromwell passed to his doom the tide of liberty was returning. On one occasion during his rule a "great debate" on the suppression of the lesser monasteries showed that elements of resistance still survived; and these elements developed rapidly as the power of the crown declined under the minority of Edward and the unpopularity of Mary. To this revival of a spirit of independence the spoliation of the church largely contributed. Partly from necessity, partly from a desire to build up a faction interested in the maintenance of their ecclesiastical policy,

Cromwell and the king squandered the vast mass of wealth which flowed into the treasury from the dissolution of the monasteries with reckless prodigality. Three hundred and seventy-six smaller houses had been suppressed in 1536; 645 greater houses were surrendered or seized in 1539. Some of the spoil was devoted to the erection of six new bishoprics; a larger part went to the fortification of the coast. But the bulk of these possessions were granted lavishly away to the nobles and courtiers about the king, and to a host of adventurers who "had become gospelers for the abbey lands." Something like a fifth of the actual land in the kingdom was in this way transferred from the holding of the church to that of nobles and gentry. Not only were the older houses enriched, but a new aristocracy was erected from among the dependents of the court. The Russells and the Cavendishes are familiar instances of families which rose from obscurity through the enormous grants of church land made to Henry's courtiers. The old baronage was thus hardly crushed before a new aristocracy took its place. "Those families within or without the bounds of the peerage," observes Mr. Hallam, "who are now deemed the most considerable, will be found, with no great number of exceptions, to have first become conspicuous under the Tudor line of kings, and, if we could trace the title of their estates, to have acquired no small portion of them mediately or immediately from monastic or other ecclesiastical foundations." The leading part which these freshly-created peers took in the events which followed Henry's death gave strength and

vigor to the whole order. But the smaller gentry shared in the general enrichment of the landed proprietors, and the new energy of the lords was soon followed by a display of political independence among the commons themselves.

610. While the prodigality of Cromwell's system thus brought into being a new check upon the crown by enriching the nobles and the lesser gentry, the religious changes it brought about gave fire and vigor to the elements of opposition which were slowly gathering. What did most to ruin the king-worship that Cromwell set up was Cromwell's ecclesiastical policy. In reducing the church to mere slavery beneath the royal power, he believed himself to be trampling down the last constitutional force which could hold the monarchy in check. What he really did was to give life and energy to new forces which were bound from their very nature to battle with the monarchy for even more than the old English freedom. When Cromwell seized on the church he held himself to be seizing for the crown the mastery which the church had wielded till now over the consciences and reverence of men. But the very humiliation of the great religious body broke the spell beneath which Englishmen had bowed. In form, nothing had been changed. The outer constitution of the church remained utterly unaltered. The English bishop, freed from the papal control, freed from the check of monastic independence, seemed greater and more imposing than ever. The priest still clung to rectory and church. If images were taken out of the churches, if here and there a rood-loft was pulled

down, or a saint's shrine demolished, no change was made in form of ritual or mode of worship. The mass was untouched. Every hymn, every prayer, was still in Latin; confession, penance, fastings and feastings, extreme unction, went on as before. There was little to show that any change had taken place; and yet every plowman felt that all was changed. The bishop, gorgeous as he might be in miter and cope, was a mere tool of the king. The priest was trembling before heretics he used to burn. Farmer or shopkeeper might enter his church any Sunday morning to find mass or service utterly transformed. The spell of tradition, of unbroken continuance, was over; and with it the power which the church had wielded over the souls of men was in great part done away.

611. It was not that the new Protestantism was as yet formidable, for violent and daring as they were, the adherents of Luther were few in number, and drawn mostly from the poorer classes among whom Wycliffite heresy had lingered, or from the class of scholars whose theological studies drew their sympathy to the movement over sea. It was that the lump was now ready to be leavened by this petty leaven, that men's hold on the firm ground of custom was broken and their minds set drifting and questioning, that little as was the actual religious change, the thought of religious change had become familiar to the people as a whole. And with religious change was certain to come religious revolt. The human conscience was hardly likely to move everywhere in strict time to the slow advance of Henry's

reforms. Men who had been roused from implicit obedience to the papacy as a revelation of the divine will by hearing the pope denounced in royal proclamations as a usurper and an impostor were hardly inclined to take up submissively the new official doctrine which substituted implicit belief in the king for implicit belief in the "bishop of Rome." But bound as church and king now were together, it was impossible to deny a tenet of the one without entering on a course of opposition to the other. Cromwell had raised against the monarchy, the most fatal of all enemies, the force of the individual conscience, the enthusiasm of religious belief, the fire of religious fanaticism. Slowly as the area of the new Protestantism extended, every man that it gained was a possible opponent of the crown. And should the time come, as the time was soon to come, when the crown moved to the side of Protestantism, then in turn every soul that the older faith retained was pledged to a life-long combat with the monarchy.

612. How irresistible was the national drift was seen on Cromwell's fall. Its first result, indeed, promised to be a reversal of all that Cromwell had done. Norfolk returned to power, and his influence over Henry seemed secured by the king's repudiation of Anne of Cleves, and his marriage in the summer of 1540 to a niece of the duke, Catharine Howard. But Norfolk's temper had now become wholly hostile to the movement about him. "I never read the scripture, nor never will!" the duke replied hotly to a Protestant arguer. "It was

merry in England afore the new learning came up; yea, I would all things were as hath been in times past." In his preference of an imperial alliance to an alliance with Francis and the Lutherans, Henry went warmly with his minister. Parted as he had been from Charles by the question of the divorce, the king's sympathies had remained true to the emperor; and at this moment he was embittered against France by the difficulties it threw in the way of his projects for gaining a hold upon Scotland. Above all, the king still clung to the hope of a purification of the church by a council, as well as of a reconciliation of England with the general body of this purified Christendom, and it was only by the emperor that such a council could be convened, or such a reconciliation brought about. An alliance with him was far from indicating any retreat from Henry's position of independence or any submission to the papacy. To the men of his own day Charles seemed no Catholic bigot. On the contrary, the stricter representatives of Catholicism, such as Paul the Fourth, denounced him as a patron of heretics, and attributed the upgrowth of Lutheranism to his steady protection and encouragement. Nor was the charge without seeming justification. The old jealousy between pope and emperor, the more recent hostility between them as rival Italian powers, had from the beginning proved Luther's security. At the first appearance of the reformer, Maximilian had recommended the Elector of Saxony to suffer no harm to be done to him; "there might come a time," said the old emperor, "when he would be needed."

Charles had looked on the matter mainly in the same political way. In his earliest years, he bought Leo's aid in his recovery of Milan from the French king by issuing the ban of the empire against Luther in the diet of Worms; but every Italian held that in suffering the reformer to withdraw unharmed, Charles had shown not so much regard to his own safe conduct as a purpose still "to keep the pope in check with that rein." And as Charles dealt with Luther so he dealt with Lutheranism. The new faith profited by the emperor's struggle with Clement the Seventh for the lordship over Italy. It was in the midst of this struggle that his brother and representative, Ferdinand, signed in the diet of Spires an imperial decree by which the German states were left free to arrange their religious affairs "as each should best answer to God and the emperor." The decree gave a legal existence to the Protestant body in the empire which it never afterward lost.

613. Such a step might well encourage the belief that Charles was himself inclining to Lutheranism; and the belief gathered strength as he sent Lutheran armies over the Alps to sack Rome and to hold the pope a prisoner. The belief was a false one, for Charles remained utterly untouched by the religious movement about him; but even when his strife with the papacy was to a great extent lulled by Clement's submission he still turned a deaf ear to the papal appeals for dealing with Lutheranism by fire and sword. His political interests and the conception which he held of his duty as emperor alike swayed him to milder counsels. He purposed, indeed, to restore

religious unity. His political aim was to bring Germany to his feet as he had brought Italy; and he saw that the religious schism was the great obstacle in the way of his realizing this design. As the temporal head of the Catholic world, he was still more strongly bent to heal the breaches of Catholicism. But he had no wish to insist on an unconditional submission to the papacy. He believed that there were evils to be cured on the one side as on the other; and Charles saw the high position which awaited him, if, as emperor, he could bring about a reformation of the church, and a reunion of Christendom. Violent as Luther's words had been, the Lutheran princes, and the bulk of Lutheran theologians, had not yet come to look on Catholicism as an irreconcilable foe. Even on the papal side there was a learned and active party, a party headed by Contarini and Pole, whose theological sympathies went in many points with the Lutherans, and who looked to the winning back of the Lutherans as the needful prelude to any reform in the doctrine and practice of the church; while Melancthon was as hopeful as Contarini that such a reform might be wrought and the church again become universal. In his proposal of a council to carry on the double work of purification and reunion, therefore, Charles stood out as the representative of the larger part both of the Catholic and the Protestant world. Against such a proposal, however, Rome struggled hard. All her tradition was against councils, where the assembled bishops had in earlier days asserted their superiority to the pope, and where the emperor, who

convened the assembly, and carried out its decrees, rose into dangerous rivalry with the papacy. Crushed as he was, Clement the Seventh, throughout his lifetime, held the proposal of a council stubbornly at bay. But under his successor, Paul the Third, the influence of Contarini and the moderate Catholics secured a more favorable reception of plans of reconciliation. In April, 1541, conferences for this purpose were, in fact, opened at Augsburg, in which Contarini, as papal legate, accepted a definition of the moot question of justification by faith which satisfied Bucer and Melancthon. On the other side, the Landgrave of Hesse, and the Elector of Brandenburg publicly declared that they believed it possible to come to terms on the yet more vexed questions of the mass and the papal supremacy.

614. Never had the reunion of the world seemed so near; and the hopes that were stirring found an echo in England as well as in Germany. We can hardly doubt, indeed, that it was the revival of these hopes which had brought about the fall of Cromwell and the recall of Norfolk to power. Norfolk, like his master, looked to a purification of the church by a council as the prelude to a reconciliation of England with the general body of Catholicism; and both saw that it was by the influence of the emperor alone that such a council could be brought about. Charles, on the other hand, was ready to welcome Henry's advances. The quarrel over Catharine had ended with her death; and the wrong done her had been in part atoned for by the fall of Anne Boleyn. The aid of Henry, too, was needed to hold in check the

opposition of France. The chief means which France still possessed of holding the emperor at bay lay in the disunion of the empire, and it was resolute to preserve this weapon against him at whatever cost to Christendom. While Francis remonstrated at Rome against the concessions made to the Lutherans by the legates, he urged the Lutheran princes to make no terms with the papacy. To the Protestants he held out hopes of his own conversion, while he promised Pope Paul that he would defend him with his life against emperor and heretics. His intrigues were aided by the suspicions of both the religious parties. Luther refused to believe in the sincerity of the concessions made by the legates; Paul the Third held aloof from them in sullen silence. Meanwhile, Francis was preparing to raise more material obstacles to the emperor's designs. Charles had bought his last reconciliation with the king by a promise of restoring the Milanese, but he had no serious purpose of ever fulfilling his pledge, and his retention of the duchy gave the French king a fair pretext for threatening a renewal of the war.

615. England, as Francis hoped, he could hold in check through his alliance with the Scots. After the final expulsion of Albany in 1524 Scottish history became little more than a strife between Margaret Tudor and her husband, the Earl of Angus, for power; but the growth of James the Fifth to manhood at last secured rest for the land. James had all the varied ability of his race, and he carried out with vigor its traditional policy. The Highland chieftains, the great lords of the lowlands, were

brought more under the royal sway; the church was strengthened to serve as a check on the feudal baronage; the alliance with France was strictly preserved, as the one security against English aggression. Nephew as he was, indeed, of the English king, James from the outset of his reign took up an attitude hostile to England. He was jealous of the influence which the two Henries had established in his realm by the marriage of Margaret and by the building up of an English party under the Douglasses; the great churchmen who formed his most trusted advisers dreaded the influence of the religious changes across the border; while the people clung to their old hatred of England and their old dependence on France. It was only by two inroads of the border lords that Henry checked the hostile intrigues of James in 1532; his efforts to influence his nephew by an interview and alliance were met by the king's marriage with two French wives in succession, Magdalen of Valois, a daughter of Francis, and Mary, a daughter of the Duke of Guise. In 1539, when the projected coalition between France and the empire threatened England, it had been needful to send Norfolk with an army to the Scotch frontier, and now that France was again hostile Norfolk had to move anew to the border in the autumn of 1541.

616. While the duke was fruitlessly endeavoring to bring James to fresh friendship, a sudden blow at home weakened his power. At the close of the year Catharine Howard was arrested on a charge of adultery; a parliament which assembled in January 1542 passed a bill of attainder; and in February the

queen was sent to the block. She was replaced by the widow of Lord Latimer, Catharine Parr; and the influence of Norfolk in the king's councils gradually gave way to that of Bishop Gardiner of Winchester. But Henry clung to the policy which the duke favored. At the end of 1541 two great calamities, the loss of Hungary after a victory of the Turks and a crushing defeat at Algiers, so weakened Charles that in the summer of the following year Francis ventured to attack him. The attack served only to draw closer the negotiations between England and the emperor; and Francis was forced, as he had threatened, to give Henry work to occupy him at home. The busiest counselor of the Scotch king, Cardinal Beaton, crossed the seas to negotiate a joint attack, and the attitude of Scotland became so menacing that in the autumn of 1542 Norfolk was again sent to the border with 20,000 men. But terrible as were his ravages, he could not bring the Scotch army to an engagement, and want of supplies soon forced him to fall back over the border. It was in vain that James urged his nobles to follow him in a counter invasion. They were ready to defend their country; but the memory of Flodden was still fresh, and success in England would only give dangerous strength to a king in whom they saw an enemy. But James was as stubborn in his purpose as the lords. Anxious only to free himself from their presence, he waited till the two armies had alike withdrawn, and then suddenly summoned his subjects to meet him in arms on the western border. A disorderly host gathered at Lochmaben and passed into Cumberland;

but the English borderers followed on them fast, and were preparing to attack, when at nightfall on the 25th of November a panic seized the whole Scotch force. Lost in the darkness and cut off from retreat by the Solway firth, thousands of men with all the baggage and guns fell into the hands of the pursuers. The news of this rout fell on the young king like a sentence of death. For a while he wandered desperately from palace to palace, till at the opening of December the tidings met him at Falkirk that his queen, Mary of Guise, had given birth to a child. His two boys had both died in youth, and he was longing passionately for an heir to the crown which was slipping from his grasp. But the child was a daughter, the Mary Stuart of later history. "The deil go with it," muttered the dying king, as his mind fell back to the close of the line of Bruce and the marriage with Robert's daughter which brought the Stuart's to the Scottish throne, "The deil go with it! It will end as it began. It came with a lass, and it will end with a lass." A few days later he died.

617. The death of James did more than remove a formidable foe. It opened up for the first time a prospect of that union of the two kingdoms which was at last to close their long hostility. Scotland, torn by factions and with a babe for queen, seemed to lie at Henry's feet; and the king seized the opportunity of completing his father's work by a union of the realms. At the opening of 1543 he proposed to the Scotch regent, the Earl of Arran, the marriage of the infant Mary Stuart with his son Edward. To

insure this bridal he demanded that Mary should at once be sent to England, the four great fortresses of Scotland be placed in English hands, and a voice given to Henry himself in the administration of the Scotch council of regency. Arran and the queen-mother, rivals as they were, vied with each other in apparent good will to the marriage; but there was a steady refusal to break the league with France, and the "English lords," as the Douglas faction were called, owned themselves helpless in face of the national jealousy of English ambition. The temper of the nation itself was seen in the answer made by the Scotch parliament which gathered in the spring. If they consented to the young queen's betrothal, they not only rejected the demands which accompanied the proposal, but insisted that in case of such a union Scotland should have a perpetual regent of its own, and that this office should be hereditary in the house of Arran. Warned by his very partisans that the delivery of Mary was impossible, that if such a demand were pressed "there was not so little a boy but he would hurl stones against it, the wives would handle their distaffs, and the commons would universally die in it." Henry's proposals dropped in July to a treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive; he suffered France to be included among the allies of Scotland named in it, he consented that the young queen should remain with her mother till the age of ten and offered guarantees for the maintenance of Scotch independence.

618. But modify it as he might, Henry knew that such a project of union could only be carried out by

a war with Francis. His negotiations for a treaty with Charles had long been delayed through Henry's wish to drag the emperor into an open breach with the papacy, but at the moment of the king's first proposals for the marriage of Mary Stuart with his son the need of finding a check upon France forced on a formal alliance with the emperor in February, 1543. The two allies agreed that the war should be continued till the duchy of Burgundy had been restored to the emperor and till England had recovered Normandy and Guienne; while the joint fleets of Henry and Charles held the channel and sheltered England from any danger of French attack. The main end of this treaty was doubtless to give Francis work at home which might prevent the despatch of a French force into Scotland and the overthrow of Henry's hopes of a Scotch marriage. These hopes were strengthened as the summer went on by the acceptance of his later proposals in a parliament which was packed by the regent, and by the actual conclusion of a marriage treaty. But if Francis could spare neither horse nor man for action in Scotland, his influence in the northern kingdom was strong enough to foil Henry's plans. The churchmen were as bitterly opposed to such a marriage as the partisans of France; and their head, Cardinal Beaton, who had held aloof from the regent parliament, suddenly seized the queen mother and her babe, crowned the infant Mary, called a parliament in December which annulled the marriage treaty, and set Henry at defiance.

619. The king's wrath at this overthrow of his

hopes showed itself in a brutal and impolitic act of vengeance. He was a skilful shipbuilder; and among the many enterprises which the restless genius of Cromwell undertook there was probably none in which Henry took so keen an interest as in his creation of an English fleet. Hitherto merchant ships had been impressed when a fleet was needed, but the progress of naval warfare had made the maintenance of an armed force at sea a condition of maritime power, and the resources furnished by the dissolution of the abbeys had been devoted in part to the building of ships of war, the largest of which, the *Mary Rose*, carried a crew of seven hundred men. The new strength which England was to wield in its navy was first seen in 1544. An army was gathered under Lord Hertford; and while Scotland was looking for the usual advance over the border, the earl's forces were quietly put on board and the English fleet appeared on the 3d of May in the firth of Forth. The surprise made resistance impossible. Leith was seized and sacked, Edinburgh, then a town of wooden houses, was given to the flames, and burned for three days and three nights. The country for seven miles round was harried into a desert. The blow was a hard one, but it was little likely to bring Scotchmen round to Henry's projects of union. A brutal raid of the English borderers on Melrose and the destruction of his ancestors' tombs estranged the Earl of Angus, and was quickly avenged by his overthrow of the marauders at An. crum moor. Henry had yet to learn the uselessness of mere force to compass his ends. "I shall be glad

to serve the King of England with my honor," said the Lord of Buccleugh to an English envoy, "but I will not be constrained thereto if all Teviotdale be burned to the bottom of hell."

620. Hertford's force returned in good time to join the army which Henry in person was gathering at Calais to co-operate with the forces assembled by Charles on the northeastern frontier of France. Each sovereign found himself at the head of 40,000 men, and the emperor's military ability was seen in his proposal for an advance of both armies upon Paris. But though Henry found no French force in his front, his cautious temper shrank from the risk of leaving fortresses in his rear; and while their allies pushed boldly past Chalons on the capital, the English troops were detained till September in the capture of Boulogne, and only left Boulogne to form the siege of Montreuil. The French were thus enabled to throw their whole force on the emperor, and Charles found himself in a position from which negotiation alone could extricate him.

His ends were in fact gained by the humiliation of France, and he had as little desire to give England a strong foothold in the neighborhood of his own Netherlands as in Wolsey's days. The widening of English territory there could hardly fail to encourage that upgrowth of heresy which the emperor justly looked upon as the greatest danger to the hold of Spain upon the Low Countries, while it would bring Henry a step nearer to the chain of Protestant states which began on the lower Rhine. The plans which Charles had formed for uniting the Catholics

and Lutherans in the conferences of Augsburg had broken down before the opposition both of Luther and the pope. On both sides, indeed, the religious contest was gathering new violence. A revival had begun in the church itself, but it was the revival of a militant and uncompromising orthodoxy. In 1542 the fanaticism of Cardinal Caraffa forced on the establishment of a supreme tribunal of the Inquisition at Rome. The next year saw the establishment of the Jesuits. Meanwhile Lutheranism took a new energy. The whole north of Germany became Protestant. In 1539 the younger branches of the house of Saxony joined the elder in a common adherence to Lutheranism; and their conversion had been followed by that of the Elector of Brandenburg. Southern Germany seemed bent on following the example of the north. The hereditary possessions of Charles himself fell away from Catholicism. The Austrian duchies were overrun with heresy. Bohemia promised soon to become Hussite again. Persecution failed to check the triumph of the new opinions in the Low Countries. The empire itself threatened to become Protestant. In 1540 the accession of the Elector Palatine robbed Catholicism of central Germany and the upper Rhine; and three years later, at the opening of the war with France, that of the Archbishop of Köln gave the Protestants not only the central Rhine land but a majority in the college of electors. It seemed impossible for Charles to prevent the empire from repudiating Catholicism in his lifetime, or to hinder the imperial crown from falling to a Protestant at his death.

621. The great fabric of power which had been built up by the policy of Ferdinand of Aragon, was thus threatened with utter ruin, and Charles saw himself forced into the struggle he had so long avoided, if not for the interests of religion, at any rate for the interests of the house of Austria. He still hoped for a reunion from the council which was assembling at Trent, and from which a purified Catholicism was to come. But he no longer hoped that the Lutherans would yield to the mere voice of the council. They would yield only to force, and the first step in such a process of compulsion must be the breaking up of their league of Schmalkald. Only France could save them; and it was to isolate them from France that Charles availed himself of the terror his march on Paris had caused, and concluded a treaty with that power in September, 1544. The progress of Protestantism had startled even France itself; and her old policy seemed to be abandoned in her promises of co-operation in the task of repressing heresy in the empire. But a stronger security against French intervention lay in the unscrupulous dexterity with which, while withdrawing from the struggle, Charles left Henry and Francis still at strife. Henry would not cede Boulogne, and Francis saw no means of forcing him to a peace save by a threat of invasion. While an army closed round Boulogne, and a squadron carried troops to Scotland, 150 French ships were gathered in the channel and crossed in the summer of 1545 to the Isle of Wight. But their attacks were feebly conducted, and the fleet at last returned to its har-

bors without striking any serious blow, while the siege of Boulogne dragged idly on through the year. Both kings, however, drew to peace. In spite of the treaty of Crepy it was impossible for France to abandon the Lutherans, and Francis was eager to free his hands for action across the Rhine. Henry, on the other hand, deserted by his ally, and with a treasury ruined by the cost of the war, was ready at last to surrender his gains in it. In June, 1546, a peace was concluded by which England engaged to surrender Boulogne on payment of a heavy ransom, and France to restore the annual subsidy which had been promised in 1525.

622. What aided in the close of the war was a new aspect of affairs in Scotland. Since the death of James the Fifth, the great foe of England in the north had been the Archbishop of St. Andrews, Cardinal Beaton. In despair of shaking his power his rivals had proposed schemes for his assassination to Henry, and these schemes had been expressly approved. But plot after plot broke down, and it was not till May, 1546, that a group of Scotch nobles who favored the reformation surprised his castle at St. Andrews. Shrieking miserably, "I am a priest! I am a priest! Fie! fie! all is gone!" the cardinal was brutally murdered, and his body hung over the castlewalls. His death made it easy to include Scotland in the peace with France, which was concluded in the summer. But in England itself, peace was a necessity. The crown was penniless. In spite of the confiscation of the abbey lands in 1539, the treasury was found empty at the very opening of the

war; the large subsidies granted by the parliament were expended; and conscious that a fresh grant could hardly be expected, even from the servile houses, the government in 1545 fell back on its old resource of benevolences. Of two London merchants who resisted this demand as illegal, one was sent to the Fleet, the second ordered to join the army on the Scotch border; but it was significant that resistance had been offered, and the failure of the war-taxes, which were voted at the close of the year to supply the royal needs, drove the council to fresh acts of confiscation. A vast mass of church property still remained for the spoiler, and by a bill of 1545 more than two thousand chauntries and chapels, with a hundred and ten hospitals, were suppressed to the profit of the crown. Enormous as his booty was, it could only be slowly realized; and the immediate pressure forced the council to take refuge in the last and worst measure any government can adopt, a debasement of the currency. The evils of such a course were felt till the reign of Elizabeth. But it was a course that could not be repeated; and financial exhaustion played its part in bringing the war to an end.

623. A still greater part was played by the aspect of affairs in the empire. Once freed from the check of the war Charles had moved fast to his aim. In 1545 he had adjusted all minor differences with Paul the Third, and pope and emperor had resolved on the immediate convocation of the council and on the enforcement of its decision by weight of arms. Should the emperor be driven to war with the Luth-

eran princes, the pope engaged to support him with all his power. "Were it needful," Paul promised, "he would sell his very crown in his service." In December the council was actually opened at Trent, and its proceedings soon showed that no concessions to the Lutherans could be looked for. The emperor's demand that the reform of the church should first be taken in hand was evaded; and on the two great questions of the authority of the Bible as a ground of faith, and of justification, the sentence of the council directly condemned the Protestant opinions. The Lutherans showed their resolve to make no submission by refusing to send representatives to Trent; and Charles carried out his pledges to the papacy by taking the field in the spring of 1546 to break up the league of Schmalkald. But the army gathered under the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse so far outnumbered the imperial forces that the emperor could not venture on a battle. Henry watched the course of Charles with a growing anxiety. The hopes of a purified and united Christendom which had drawn him a few years back to the emperor's side faded before the stern realities of the council. The highest pretensions of the papacy had been sanctioned by the bishops gathered at Trent; and to the pretensions of the papacy Henry was resolved not to bow. He was driven, whether he would or no, on the policy of Cromwell; and in the last months of his life he offered aid to the league of Schmalkald. His offers were rejected, for the Lutheran princes had no faith in his sincerity, and believed themselves strong

enough to deal with the emperor without foreign help.

624. But his attitude without told on his policy at home. To the hotter Catholics as to the hotter Protestants the years since Cromwell's fall had seemed years of a gradual return to Catholicism. There had been a slight sharpening of persecution for the Protestants, and restrictions had been put on the reading of the English Bible. The alliance with Charles and the hope of reconciling England anew with a pacified Christendom gave fresh cause for suppressing heresy. Neither Norfolk nor his master, indeed, desired any rigorous measure of reaction, for Henry remained proud of the work he had done. His bitterness against the papacy only grew as the years went by; and at the very moment that heretics were suffering for a denial of the mass, others were suffering by their side for a denial of the supremacy. But strange and anomalous as the system seemed, the drift of Henry's religious government had as yet been in one direction, that of a return to and reconciliation with the body of the Catholic church. With the decision of the council and the new attitude of the emperor this drift was suddenly arrested. It was not that Henry realized the revolution that was opening before him, or the vast importance of the steps which his policy now led him to take. His tendency, like that of his people, was religious rather than theological, practical rather than speculative. Of the immense problems which were opening in the world, neither he nor England saw anything. The religious strife which

was to break Europe asunder was to the king as to the bulk of Englishmen a quarrel of words and hot temper; the truth which Christendom was to rend itself to pieces in striving to discover was a thing that could easily be found with the aid of God. There is something humorous as there is something pathetic in the warnings which Henry addressed to the parliament at the close of 1545. The shadow of death as it fell over him gave the king's words a new gentleness and tenderness. "The special foundation of our religion being charity between man and man, it is so refrigerate, as there never was more dissension and lack of love between man and man, the occasions whereof are opinions only and names devised for the continuance of the same. Some are called papists, some Lutherans, and some Anabaptists; names devised of the devil, and yet not fully without ground for the severing of one man's heart by conceit of opinion from the other." But the remedy was a simple one. Every man was "to travail first for his own amendment." Then the bishops and clergy were to agree in their teaching, "which, seeing there is but one truth and verity, they may easily do, calling therein for the grace of God." Then the nobles and laity were to be pious and humble, to read their new Bibles "reverently and humbly, . . . and in any doubt to resort to the learned or, at best, higher powers." "I am very sorry to know and hear how unreverently that precious jewel, the word of God, is disputed, rimed, sung, and jangled in every alehouse and tavern. This kind of man is depraved, and that

kind of man, this ceremony and that ceremony." All this controversy might be done away by simple charity. "Therefore be in charity one with another, like brother and brother. Have respect to the pleasing of God; and then I doubt not that love I spoke of shall never be dissolved between us."

625. There is something wonderful in the English coolness and narrowness, in the speculative blindness and practical good sense which could look out over such a world at such a moment, and could see nothing in it save a quarrel of "opinions, and of names devised for the continuance of the same." But Henry only expressed the general feeling of his people. England, indeed, was being slowly leavened with a new spirit. The humiliation of the clergy, the Lutheran tendencies of half the bishops, the crash of the abbeys, the destruction of chauntries and mass-chapels, a measure which told closely on the actual worship of the day, the new articles of faith, the diffusion of Bibles, the "jangling" and discussion which followed on every step in the king's course, were all telling on the thoughts of men. But the temper of the nation as a whole remained religiously conservative. It drifted rather to the moderate reforms of the new learning rather than to any radical reconstruction of the church. There was a general disinclination, indeed, to push matters to either extreme, a general shrinking from the persecution which the Catholic called for as from the destruction which the Protestant was desiring. It was significant that a new heresy bill which passed through the lords in 1545

quietly disappeared when it reached the commons. But this shrinking rested rather on national than on theological grounds, on a craving for national union which Henry expressed in his cry for "brotherly love," and on an imperfect appreciation of the real nature or consequence of the points at issue which made men shrink from burning their neighbors for "opinions and names devised for the continuance of the same." What Henry and what the bulk of Englishmen wanted was, not indeed wholly to rest in what had been done, but to do little more save the remedying of obvious abuses or the carrying on of obvious improvements. One such improvement was the supplying men with the means of private devotion in their own tongue, a measure from which none but the fanatics of either side dissented. This process went slowly on in the issuing of two primers in 1535 and 1539, the rendering into English of the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments, the publication of an English litany for outdoor processions in 1544, and the adding to this of a collection of English prayers in 1545.

626. But the very tone of Henry shows his consciousness that this religious truce rested on his will alone. Around him as he lay dying stood men who were girding themselves to a fierce struggle for power, a struggle that could not fail to wake the elements of religious discord which he had striven to lull asleep. Adherents of the papacy, advocates of a new submission to a foreign spiritual jurisdiction, there were few or none; for the most conservative of English churchmen or nobles had as yet no

wish to restore the older Roman supremacy. But Norfolk and Gardiner were content with this assertion of national and ecclesiastical independence; in all matters of faith they were earnest to conserve, to keep things as they were, and in front of them stood a group of nobles who were bent on radical change. The marriages, the reforms, the profusion of Henry, had aided him in his policy of weakening the nobles by building up a new nobility which sprang from the court and was wholly dependent on the crown. Such were the Russells, the Cavendishes, the Wriothesleys, the Fitzwilliams. Such was John Dudley, a son of the Dudley who had been put to death for his financial oppression in Henry the Seventh's days, but who had been restored in blood, attached to the court, raised to the peerage as Lord Lisle, and who, whether as adviser or general, had been actively employed in high stations at the close of this reign. Such, above all, were the two brothers of Jane Seymour. The elder of the two, Edward Seymour, had been raised to the earldom of Hertford, and intrusted with the command of the English army in its operations against Scotland. As uncle of Henry's boy Edward, he could not fail to play a leading part in the coming reign; and the nobles of the "new blood," as their opponents called them in disdain, drew round him as their head. Without any historical hold on the country, raised by the royal caprice, and enriched by the spoil of the monasteries, these nobles were pledged to the changes from which they had sprung and to the party of change. Over the mass of the

nation their influence was small; and in the strife for power with the older nobles which they were anticipating they were forced to look to the small but resolute body of men who, whether from religious enthusiasm or from greed of wealth or power, were bent on bringing the English church nearer to conformity with the reformed churches of the continent. As Henry drew to his grave, the two factions faced each other with gathering dread and gathering hate. Hot words betrayed their hopes. "If God should call the king to his mercy," said Norfolk's son, Lord Surrey, "who were so meet to govern the prince as my lord my father?" "Rather than it should come to pass," retorted a partisan of Hertford's, "that the prince should be under the governance of your father or you, I would abide the adventure to thrust a dagger in you!"

627. In the history of English poetry the name of Lord Surrey takes an illustrious place. An Elizabethan writer tells us how at this time "sprang up a new company of courtly makers, of whom Sir Thomas Wyatt the elder and Henry, Earl of Surrey, were the two chieftains; who having travelled to Italy, and there tested the sweet and stately measures and style of the Italian poesy, as novices newly crept out of the schools of Dante, Ariosto, and Petrarch, they greatly polished our rude and homely manner of vulgar poesy from what it had been before, and for that cause may justly be said to be the first reformers of our English meter and style." The dull moralizings of the rhymers who followed Chaucer, the rough but vivacious doggerel of Skel-

ton, made way in the hands of Wyatt and Surrey, for delicate imitations of the songs, sonnets, and rondels of Italy and France. With the Italian conceits came an Italian refinement whether of words or of thought; and the force and versatility of Surrey's youth showed itself in whimsical satires, in classical translations, in love-sonnets, and in paraphrases of the psalms. In his version of two books of the *Æneid* he was the first to introduce into England the Italian blank verse which was to play so great a part in our literature. But with the poetic taste of the renaissance Surrey inherited its wild and reckless energy. Once he was sent to the Fleet for challenging a gentleman to fight. Release enabled him to join his father in an expedition against Scotland, but he was no sooner back than the Londoners complained how at Candlemas the young lord and his comrades "went out with stone-bows at midnight," and how next day "there was great clamor of the breaking of many glass windows both of houses and churches, and shouting at men that might be in the streets." In spite of his humorous excuse that the jest only purposed to bring home to men that "from justice's rod no fault is free, but that all such as work unright in most quiet are next unrest," Surrey paid for this outbreak with a fresh arrest which drove him to find solace in paraphrases of Ecclesiastes and the psalms. Soon he was over sea with the English troops in Flanders, and in 1544 serving as marshal of the camp to conduct the retreat after the siege of Montreuil. Sent to relieve Boulogne, he remained in charge of the town till

the spring of 1546, when he returned to England to rhyme sonnets to a fair Geraldine, the daughter of the Earl of Kildare, and to plunge into the strife of factions around the dying king.

628. All moral bounds had been loosened by the spirit of the renaissance, and, if we accept the charge of his rivals, Surrey now aimed at gaining a hold on Henry by offering him his sister as mistress. It is as possible that the young earl was aiming simply at the displacement of Catharine Parr, and at the renewal by his sister's elevation to the throne of that matrimonial hold upon Henry which the Howards had already succeeded in gaining through the unions with Anne Boleyn and Catharine Howard. But a temper such as Surrey's was ill-matched against the subtle and unscrupulous schemers who saw their enemy in a pride that scorned the "new men" about him and vowed that when once the king was dead "they should smart for it." The turn of foreign affairs gave a fresh strength to the party which sympathized with the Protestants and denounced that alliance with the emperor which had been throughout the policy of the Howards. Henry's offer of aid to the Lutheran princes marked the triumph of this party in the royal councils; and the new steps which Cranmer was suffered to make toward an English liturgy showed that the religious truce of Henry's later years was at last abandoned. Hertford, the head of the "new men," came more to the front as the waning health of the king brought Jane Seymour's boy, Edward, nearer to the throne. In the new reign Hertford, as the boy's uncle, was sure to

play a great part; and he used his new influence to remove the only effective obstacle to his future greatness. Surrey's talk of his royal blood, the duke's quartering of the royal arms to mark his Plantagenet descent, and some secret interviews with the French ambassador were adroitly used to wake Henry's jealousy of the dangers which might beset the throne of his child. Norfolk and his son were alike committed to the Tower at the close of 1546. A month later Surrey was condemned and sent to the block, and his father was only saved by the sudden death of Henry the Eighth in January, 1547.

629. By an act passed in the parliament of 1544 it had been provided that the crown should pass to Henry's son Edward, and on Edward's death without issue, to his sister Mary. Should Mary prove childless it was to go to Elizabeth, the child of Anne Boleyn. Beyond this point the houses would make no provision, but power was given to the king to make further dispositions by will. At his death it was found that Henry had passed over the line of his sister Margaret of Scotland, and named as next in the succession to Elizabeth the daughters of his younger sister Mary by her marriage with Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk. As Edward was but nine years old, Henry had appointed a carefully balanced council of regency; but the will fell into Hertford's keeping, and when the list of regents was at last disclosed, Gardiner, who had till now been the leading minister, was declared to have been excluded from the number of executors. Whether the exclusion was Henry's act or the act of the men who used

his name, the absence of the bishop with the imprisonment of Norfolk threw the balance of power on the side of the "new men" who were represented by Hertford and Lisle. Their chief opponent, the Chancellor Wriothesley, struggled in vain against their next step toward supremacy, the modification of Henry's will by the nomination of Hertford as protector of the realm and governor of Edward's person. Alleged directions from the dying king served as pretexts for the elevation of the whole party to higher rank in the state. It was to repair "the decay of the old English nobility" that Hertford raised himself to the dukedom of Somerset and his brother to the barony of Seymour, the queen's brother, Lord Parr, to the marquissate of Northampton, Lisle to the earldom of Warwick, Russell to that of Bedford, Wriothesley to that of Southampton. Ten of their partisans became barons, and as the number of peers, in spite of recent creations, still stood at about fifty, such a group constituted a power in the upper house. Alleged directions of the king were conveniently remembered to endow the new peers with public money, though the treasury was beggered and the debt pressing. The expulsion of Wriothesley from the chancellorship and council soon left the "new men" without a check; but they were hardly masters of the royal power when a bold stroke of Somerset laid all at his feet. A new patent of protectorate, drawn out in the boy-king's name, empowered his uncle to act with or without the consent of his fellow executors, and left him supreme in the realm.

630. Boldly and adroitly as the whole revolution had been managed, it was none the less a revolution. To crush their opponents, the council had first used, and then set aside, Henry's will. Hertford in turn, by the use of his nephew's name, set aside both the will and the council. A country gentleman, who had risen by the accident of his sister's queenship to high rank at the court, had thus by sheer intrigue and self-assertion made himself ruler of the realm. But daring and self-confident as he was, Somerset was forced by his very elevation to seek support for the power he had won by this surprise in measures which marked the retreat of the monarchy from that position of pure absolutism which it had reached at the close of Henry's reign. The statute that had given to royal proclamations the force of law was repealed, and several of the new felonies and treasons which Cromwell had created and used with so terrible an effect were erased from the statute book. The popularity, however, which such measures won was too vague a force to serve in the strife of the moment. Against the pressure of the conservative party who had so suddenly found themselves jockeyed out of power, Somerset and the "new men" could look for no help but from the Protestants. The hope of their support united with the new protector's personal predilections in his patronage of the innovations against which Henry had battled to the last. Cranmer had now drifted into a purely Protestant position, and his open break with the older system followed quickly on Seymour's rise to power. "This year," says a contemporary, "the Archbishop of Canter-

bury did eat meat openly in Lent in the hall of Lambeth, the like of which was never seen since England was a Christian country." This notable act was followed by a rapid succession of sweeping changes. The legal prohibitions of Lollardry were rescinded; six articles were repealed; a royal injunction removed all pictures and images from the churches. A formal statute gave priests the right to marry. A resolution of convocation which was confirmed by parliament brought about the significant change which first definitely marked the severance of the English church in doctrine from the Roman, by ordering that the sacrament of the altar should be administered in both kinds.

631. A yet more significant change followed. The old tongue of the church was now to be disused in public worship. The universal use of Latin had marked the Catholic and European character of the older religion; the use of English marked the strictly national and local character of the new system. In the spring of 1548 a new communion service in English took the place of the mass; an English book of common prayer, the liturgy, which with slight alterations is still used in the church of England, soon replaced the missal and breviary from which its contents are mainly drawn. The name "common prayer," which was given to the new liturgy, marked its real import. The theory of worship which prevailed through mediæval Christendom, the belief that the worshipper assisted only at rites wrought for him by priestly hands, at a sacrifice wrought through priestly intervention, at the offering of prayer and

praise by priestly lips, was now set at naught. "The laity," it has been picturesquely said, "were called up into the chancel." The act of devotion became a "common prayer" of the whole body of worshippers. The mass became a "communion" of the whole Christian fellowship. The priest was no longer the offerer of a mysterious sacrifice, the mediator between God and the worshiper; he was set on a level with the rest of the church, and brought down to be the simple mouth-piece of the congregation.

632. What gave a wider importance to these measures was their bearing on the general politics of Christendom. The adhesion of England to the Protestant cause came at a moment when Protestantism seemed on the verge of ruin. The confidence of the Lutheran princes in their ability to resist the emperor had been seen in their refusal of succor from Henry the Eighth. But in the winter of Henry's death the secession of Duke Maurice of Saxony with many of his colleagues from the league of Schmalkald so weakened the Protestant body that Charles was able to put its leaders to the ban of the empire. Hertford was hardly protector when the German princes called loudly for aid; but the 50,000 crowns which were secretly sent by the English council could scarcely have reached them when in April, 1547, Charles surprised their camp at Muhlberg and routed their whole army. The elector of Saxony was taken prisoner; the Landgrave of Hesse surrendered in despair. His victory left Charles master of the empire. The jealousy of the pope, indeed, at

once revived with the emperor's success, and his recall of the bishops from Trent forced Charles to defer his wider plans for enforcing religious unity; while in Germany itself he was forced to reckon with Duke Maurice and the Protestant princes who had deserted the league of Schmalkald, but whose one object in joining the emperor had been to provide a check on his after movements. For the moment, therefore, he was driven to prolong the religious truce by an arrangement called the "interim." But the emperor's purpose was now clear. Wherever his power was actually felt, the religious reaction began; and the imperial towns which held firmly to the Lutheran creed were reduced by force of arms. It was of the highest moment that in this hour of despair the Protestants saw their rule suddenly established in a new quarter, and the Lutheranism which was being trampled under foot in its own home triumphant in England. England became the common refuge of the panic struck Protestants. Bucer and Fagius were sent to lecture at Cambridge, Peter Martyr advocated the anti-sacramentarian views of Calvin at Oxford. Cranmer welcomed refugees from every country, Germans, Italians, French, Poles, and Swiss, to his place at Lambeth. When persecution broke out in the low countries, the fugitive Walloons were received at London and Canterbury, and allowed to set up in both places for their own churches.

633. But Somerset dreamed of a wider triumph for "the religion." On his death-bed Henry was said to have enforced on the council the need of car-

rying out his policy of a union of Scotland with England through the marriage of its queen with his boy. A wise statesmanship would have suffered the Protestant movement which had been growing stronger in the northern kingdom since Beaton's death, to run quietly its course; and his colleagues warned Somerset to leave Scotch affairs untouched till Edward was old enough to undertake them in person. But these counsels were set aside; and a renewal of the border warfare enforced the protector's demands for a closer union of the kingdoms. The jealousy of France was roused at once, and a French fleet appeared off the Scottish coast to reduce the castle of St. Andrews, which had been held since Beaton's death by the English partisans who murdered him. The challenge called Somerset himself to the field; and crossing the Tweed with a fine army of 18,000 men in the summer of 1547, the protector pushed along the coast till he found the scots encamped behind the Esk on the slopes of Musselburgh, six miles eastward of Edinburgh. The English invasion had drawn all the factions of the kingdom together against the stranger, and a body of "gospelers" under Lord Angus formed the advance-guard of the Scotch army as it moved by its right on the 10th of September to turn the English position and drive Somerset into the sea. The English horse charged the Scottish front only to be flung off by its pikemen; but their triumph threw the Lowlanders into disorder, and as they pushed forward in pursuit their advance was roughly checked by the fire of a body of Italian musketeers whom Somerset had

brought with him. The check was turned into a defeat by a general charge of the English line, a fatal panic broke the Scottish host, and 10,000 men fell in its headlong flight beneath the English lances.

684. Victor as he was at Pinkie Cleugh, Somerset was soon forced by famine to fall back from the wasted country. His victory, indeed, had been more fatal to the interests of England than a defeat. The Scots in despair turned as of old to France, and bought its protection by consenting to the child-queen's marriage with the son of Henry the Second, who had followed Francis on the throne. In the summer of 1548 Mary Stuart sailed under the escort of a French fleet and landed safely at Brest. Not only was the Tudor policy of union foiled, as it seemed, forever, but Scotland was henceforth to be a part of the French realm. To north as to south, England would feel the pressure of the French king. Nor was Somerset's policy more successful at home. The religious changes he was forcing on the land were carried through with the despotism, if not with the vigor, of Cromwell. In his acceptance of the personal supremacy of the sovereign, Gardiner was ready to bow to every change which Henry had ordered, or which his son, when of age to be fully king, might order in the days to come. But he denounced all ecclesiastical changes made during the king's minority as illegal and invalid. Untenable as it was, this protest probably represented the general mind of Englishmen; but the bishop was committed by council to prison in the fleet, and though soon released was sent by the protector to the Tower.

The power of preaching was restricted by the issue of licenses only to the friends of the primate. While all counter arguments were rigidly suppressed, a crowd of Protestant pamphleteers flooded the country with vehement invectives against the mass and its superstitious accompaniments. The suppression of chauntries and religious guilds which was now being carried out enabled Somerset to buy the assent of noble and landowner to his measures by glutting their greed with the last spoils of the church.

635. But it was impossible to buy off the general aversion of the people to the protector's measures ; and German and Italian mercenaries had to be introduced to stamp out the popular discontent which broke out in the east, in the west, and in the midland counties. Everywhere men protested against the new changes and called for the maintenance of the system of Henry the Eighth. The Cornishmen refused to receive the new service, "because it is like a Christmas game." In 1549 Devonshire demanded by open revolt the restoration of the mass and the six articles, as well as a partial re-establishment of the suppressed abbeys. The agrarian discontent woke again in the general disorder. Inclosures and evictions were going steadily on, and the bitterness of the change was being heightened by the results of the dissolution of the abbeys. Church lands had always been underlet, the monks were easy landlords, and on no estates had the peasantry been as yet so much exempt from the general revolution in culture. But the new lay masters to whom the abbey lands fell were quick to reap their full value by

a rise of rents and by the same processes of eviction and inclosure as went on elsewhere. The distress was deepened by the change in the value of money, which was now beginning to be felt from the mass of gold and silver which the New World was yielding to the Old, and still more by a general rise of prices that followed on the debasement of the coinage which had begun with Henry and went on yet more unscrupulously under Somerset. The trouble came at last to a head in the manufacturing districts of the eastern counties ; 20,000 men gathered round an "oak of reformation" near Norwich, and repulsing the royal troops in a deperate engagement, renewed the old cries for a removal of evil counselors, a prohibition of inclosures, and redress for the grievances of the poor.

636. The revolt of the Norfolk men was stamped out in blood by the energy of Lord Warwick, as the revolt in the west had been put down by Lord Russell, but the risings had given a fatal blow to Somerset's power. It had already been weakened by strife within his own family. His brother Thomas had been created Lord Seymour and raised to the post of lord high admiral ; but glutted as he was with lands and honors, his envy at Somerset's fortunes broke out in a secret marriage with the queen-dowager, Catharine Parr, in an attempt, on her death, to marry Elizabeth, and in intrigues to win the confidence of the young king and detach him from his brother. Seymour's discontent was mounting into open revolt when, in the January of 1549, he was arrested, refused a trial, attainted, and sent

to the block. The stain of a brother's blood, however justly shed, rested from that hour on Somerset, while the nobles were estranged from him by his resolve to enforce the laws against inclosures and evictions, as well as by the weakness he had shown in the presence of the revolt. Able, indeed, as Somerset was, his temper was not that of a ruler of men; and his miserable administration had all but brought government to a stand-still. While he was dreaming of a fresh invasion of Scotland the treasury was empty, not a servant of the state was paid, and the soldiers he had engaged on the continent refused to cross the channel, in despair of receiving their hire. It was only by loans raised at ruinous interest that the protector escaped sheer bankruptcy when the revolts in east and west came to swell the royal expenses. His weakness in tampering with the popular demands completed his ruin. The nobles dreaded a communistic outbreak like that of the Suabian peasantry, and their dread was justified by prophecies that monarchy and nobility were alike to be destroyed and a new rule set up under governors elected by the people. They dreaded yet more the being forced to disgorge their spoil to appease the discontent. At the close of 1549, therefore, the council withdrew openly from Somerset, and forced the protector to resign.

637. His office passed to the Earl of Warwick, to whose ruthless severity the suppression of the revolt was mainly due. The change of governors, however, brought about no change of system. Peace, indeed, was won from France by the immediate sur-

render of Boulogne; but the misgovernment remained as great as ever, the currency was yet further debased, and a wild attempt made to remedy the effects of this measure by a royal fixing of prices. It was in vain that Latimer denounced the prevailing greed, and bade the Protestant lords choose "either restitution or else damnation." Their sole aim seemed to be that of building up their own fortunes at the cost of the state. All pretence of winning popular sympathy was gone, and the rule of the upstart nobles who formed the council of regency became simply a rule of terror. "The greater part of the people," one of their creatures, Cecil, avowed, "is not in favor of defending this cause, but of aiding its adversaries; on that side are the greater part of the nobles, who absent themselves from court, all the bishops save three or four, almost all the judges and lawyers, almost all the justices of the peace, the priests, who can move their flocks any way, for the whole of the commonalty is in such a state of irritation that it will easily follow any stir toward change." But united as it was in its opposition, the nation was helpless. The system of despotism which Cromwell built up had been seized by a knot of adventurers, and with German and Italian mercenaries at their disposal they rode rough-shod over the land.

638. At such a moment it seemed madness to provoke foes abroad as well as at home, but the fanaticism of the young king was resolved to force on his sister Mary a compliance with the new changes, and her resistance was soon backed by the remonstrances of her cousin, the emperor. Charles was now at the

height of his power, master of Germany, preparing to make the empire hereditary in the person of his son Philip, and preluding a wider effort to suppress heresy throughout the world by the establishment of the Inquisition in the Netherlands and a fiery prosecution which drove thousands of Walloon heretics to find a refuge in England. But heedless of dangers from without and dangers from within, Cranmer and his colleagues advanced more boldly than ever in the career of innovation. Four prelates who adhered to the older system were deprived of their sees and committed on frivolous pretexts to the Tower. A new catechism embodied the doctrines of the reformers, and a book of homilies which enforced the chief Protestant tenets were ordered to be read in churches. A crowning defiance was given to the doctrine of the mass by an order to demolish the stone altars and replace them by wooden tables, which were stationed for the most part in the middle of the church. In 1552 a revised prayer-book was issued, and every change made in it leaned directly toward the extreme Protestantism which was at this time finding a home at Geneva. On the cardinal point of difference, the question of the sacrament, the new formularies broke away not only from the doctrine of Rome but from that of Luther, and embodied the anti-sacramentarian tenets of Zuingli and Calvin. Forty-two articles of religion were introduced; and, though since reduced by omissions to thirty-nine, these have remained to this day the formal standard of doctrine in the English church. Like the prayer-book, they

were mainly the work of Cranmer; and belonging as they did to the class of confessions which were now being framed in Germany to be presented to the council of Christendom which Charles was still resolute to re-assemble, they marked the adhesion of England to the Protestant movement on the continent. Even the episcopal mode of government which still connected the English church with the old Catholic communion was reduced to a form; in Cranmer's mind the spiritual powers of the bishops were drawn simply from the king's commission as their temporal jurisdiction was exercised in the king's name. They were reduced, therefore, to the position of royal officers, and called to hold their offices simply at the royal pleasure. The sufferings of the Protestants had failed to teach them the worth of religious liberty; and a new code of ecclesiastical laws, which was ordered to be drawn up by a board of commissioners as a substitute for the canon law of the Catholic church, although it shrank from the penalty of death, attached that of perpetual imprisonment or exile to the crimes of heresy, blasphemy, and adultery, and declared excommunication to involve a severance of the offender from the mercy of God and his deliverance into the tyranny of the devil. Delays in the completion of this code prevented its legal establishment during Edward's reign; but the use of the new liturgy and attendance at the new service were enforced by imprisonment, and subscriptions to the articles of faith was demanded by royal authority from all clergymen, churchwardens, and schoolmasters.

639. The distaste for changes so hurried and so rigorously enforced was increased by the daring speculations of the more extreme Protestants. The real value of the religious revolution of the sixteenth century to mankind lay, not in its substitution of one creed for another, but in the new spirit of inquiry, the new freedom of thought and of discussion, which was awakened during the process of change. But however familiar such a truth may be to us, it was absolutely hidden from the England of the time. Men heard with horror that the foundations of faith and morality were questioned, polygamy advocated, oaths denounced as unlawful, community of goods raised into a sacred obligation, the very Godhead of the founder of Christianity denied. The repeal of the statute of heresy left, indeed, the powers of the common law intact, and Cranmer availed himself of these to send heretics of the last class without mercy to the stake. But within the church itself the primate's desire for uniformity was roughly resisted by the more ardent members of his own party. Hooper, who had been named Bishop of Gloucester, refused to wear the episcopal habits, and denounced them as the livery of the "harlot of Babylon," a name for the papacy which was supposed to have been discovered in the Apocalypse. Ecclesiastical order came almost to an end. Priests flung aside the surplice as superstitious. Patrons of livings presented their huntsmen or gamekeepers to the benefices in their gift, and kept the stipend. All teaching of divinity ceased at the universities: the students, indeed, had fallen off in

numbers, the libraries were in part scattered or burned, the intellectual impulse of the new learning died away. One noble measure, indeed, the foundation of eighteen grammar schools, was destined to throw a luster over the name of Edward, but it had no time to bear fruit in his reign.

640. While the reckless energy of the reformers brought England to the verge of chaos, it brought Ireland to the brink of rebellion. The fall of Cromwell had been followed by a long respite in the religious changes which he was forcing on the conquered dependency; but with the accession of Edward the Sixth the system of change was renewed with all the energy of Protestant zeal. In 1551 the bishops were summoned before the deputy, Sir Anthony St. Leger, to receive the new English liturgy which, though written in a tongue as strange to the native Irish as Latin itself, was now to supersede the Latin service-book in every diocese. The order was the signal for an open strife. "Now shall every illiterate fellow read mass," burst forth Dowdall, the Archbishop of Armagh, as he flung out of the chamber with all but one of his suffragans at his heels. Archbishop Browne of Dublin, on the other hand, was followed in his profession of obedience by the Bishops of Meath, Limerick, and Kildare. The government, however, was far from quailing before the division of the episcopate. Dowdall was driven from the country; and the vacant seas were filled with protestants, like Bale, of the most advanced type. But no change could be wrought by measures such as these in the opinions of the people

themselves. The new episcopal reformers spoke no Irish, and of their English sermons not a word was understood by the rude kerns around the pulpit. The native priests remained silent. "As for preaching we have none," reports a zealous Protestant, "without which the ignorant can have no knowledge." The prelates who used the new prayer-book were simply regarded as heretics. The Bishop of Meath was assured by one of his flock that, "if the country wist how, they would eat you." Protestantism had failed to wrest a single Irishman from his older convictions, but it succeeded in uniting all Ireland against the crown. The old political distinctions which had been produced by the conquest of Strongbow, faded before the new struggle for a common faith. The population within the pale and without it became one, "not as the Irish nation," it has been acutely said, "but as Catholics." A new sense of national identity was found in the identity of religion. "Both English and Irish begin to oppose your lordship's orders," Brown had written to Cromwell at the very outset of these changes, "and to lay aside the national old quarrels."

641. Over sea, indeed, the perils of the new government passed suddenly away. Charles had backed Mary's resistance with threats, and as he moved forward to that mastery of the world to which he confidently looked, his threats might any day become serious dangers. But the peace with England had set the French government free to act in Germany, and it found allies in the great middle party of princes whose succession from the league of Schmal-

kald had seemed to bring ruin to the Protestant cause. The aim of Duke Maurice in bringing them to desert the league had been to tie the Emperor's hands by the very fact of their joining him, and for a while this policy had been successful. But the death of Paul the Third, whose jealousy had till now foiled the emperor's plans, and the accession of an imperial nominee to the papal throne, enabled Charles to move more boldly to his ends, and at the close of 1551 a fresh assembly of the council at Trent, and an imperial summons of the Lutheran powers to send divines to its sessions and to submit to its decisions, brought matters to an issue. Maurice was forced to accept the aid of the stranger, and to conclude a secret treaty with France. He was engaged as a general of Charles in the siege of Magdeburg; but in the spring of 1552 the army he had then at command was suddenly marched to the south, and through the passes of the Tyrol the duke moved straight on the imperial camp at Innspruck. Charles was forced to flee for very life, while the council at Trent broke hastily up, and in a few months the whole imperial design was in ruin. Henry the Second was already moving on the Rhine; to meet the French king, Charles was forced to come to terms with the Lutheran princes; and his signature in the summer of a treaty at Passau secured to their states the free exercise of the reformed religion, and gave the Protestant princes their due weight in the tribunals of the Empire.

642. The humiliation of the emperor, the fierce warfare which now engaged both his forces and

those of France, removed from England the danger of outer interference. But within the misrule went recklessly on. All that men saw was a religious and political chaos, in which ecclesiastical order had perished and in which politics were dying down into the squabbles of a knot of nobles over the spoils of the church and the crown. Not content with Somerset's degradation, the council charged him in 1551 with treason, and sent him to the block. Honors and lands were lavished as ever on themselves and their adherents. Warwick became Duke of Northumberland, Lord Dorset was made Duke of Suffolk, Paulet rose to the Marquisate of Winchester, Sir William Herbert was created Earl of Pembroke. The plunder of the chauntries and the guilds failed to glut the appetite of the crew of spoilers. Half the lands of every see were flung to them in vain; an attempt was made to satisfy their greed by a suppression of the wealthy see of Durham; and the whole endowments of the church were threatened with confiscation. But while the courtiers gorged themselves with manors, the treasury grew poorer. The coinage was again debased. Crown lands to the value of five millions of our modern money had been granted away to the friends of Somerset and Warwick. The royal expenditure amounted in seventeen years to more than four times its previous total. In spite of the brutality and bloodshed with which revolt had been suppressed, and of the foreign soldiery on whom the council relied, there were signs of resistance which would have made less reckless statesmen pause. The temper of the parliament

had drifted far from the slavish subservience which it showed at the close of Henry's reign. The house of commons met Northumberland's project for the pillage of the bishopric of Durham with opposition, and rejected a new treason bill. In 1552 the Duke was compelled to force nominees of his own on the constituencies by writs from the council before he could count on a house to his mind. Such writs had been often issued since the days of Henry the Seventh; but the ministers of Edward were driven to an expedient which shows how rapidly the temper of independence was growing. The summons of new members from places hitherto unrepresented was among the prerogatives of the crown, and the protectorate used this power to issue writs to small villages in the west which could be trusted to return members to its mind.

643. This "packing of parliament" was to be largely extended in the following reigns; but it passed as yet with little comment. What really kept England quiet was a trust that the young king, who would be of age in two or three years, would then set all things right again. "When he comes of age," said a Hampshire squire, "he will see another rule and hang up a hundred heretic knaves." Edward's temper was as lordly as that of his father, and had he once really reigned he would probably have dealt as roughly with the plunderers who had used his name as England hoped. But he was a fanatical Protestant, and his rule would almost certainly have forced on a religious strife as bitter and disastrous as the strife which broke the strength of Germany and France.

From this calamity the country was saved by his waning health. Edward was now fifteen, but in the opening of 1553 the signs of coming death became too clear for Northumberland and his fellows to mistake them. By the statute of the succession the death of the young king would bring Mary to the throne; and as Mary was known to have refused acceptance of all changes in her father's system, and was looked on as anxious only to restore it, her accession became a subject of national hope. But to Northumberland and his fellows her succession was fatal. They had personally outraged Mary by their attempts to force her into compliance with their system. Her first act would be to free Norfolk and the bishops whom they held prisoners in the Tower, and to set these bitter enemies in power. With ruin before them the Protestant lords were ready for a fresh revolution; and the bigotry of the young king fell in with their plans.

644. In his zeal for "the religion," and in his absolute faith in his royal autocracy, Edward was ready to override will and statute and to set Mary's rights aside. In such a case the crown fell legally to Elizabeth, the daughter of Anne Boleyn, who had been placed by the act next in succession to Mary, and whose training under Catherine Parr and the Seymours gave good hopes of her protestant sympathies. The cause of Elizabeth would have united the whole of the "new men" in its defense, and might have proved a formidable difficulty in Mary's way. But for the maintainance of his personal power Northumberland could as little count on

Elizabeth as on Mary; and in Edward's death the Duke saw a chance of raising, if not himself, at any rate his own blood to the throne. He persuaded the young king that he possessed as great a right as his father to settle the succession of the crown by will. Henry had passed by the children of his sister Margaret of Scotland, and had placed next to Elizabeth in the succession the children of his younger sister Mary, the wife of Charles Brandon, the Duke of Suffolk. Frances, Mary's child by this marriage, was still living, the mother of three daughters by her marriage with Grey, Lord Dorset, a hot partisan of the religious changes, who had been raised under the protectorate to the Dukedom of Suffolk. Frances was a woman of thirty-seven; but her accession to the crown squared as little with Northumberland's plans as that of Mary or Elizabeth. In the will, therefore, which the young king drew up Edward was brought to pass over Frances, and to name as his successor her eldest daughter the Lady Jane Grey. The marriage of Jane Grey with Guilford Dudley, the fourth son of Northumberland, was all that was needed to complete the unscrupulous plot. It was the celebration of this marriage in May which first woke a public suspicion of the existence of such designs, and the general murmur which followed on the suspicion might have warned the Duke of his danger. But the secret was closely kept, and it was only in June that Edward's "plan" was laid in the same strict secrecy before Northumberland's colleagues. A project which raised the Duke into a virtual sovereignty over the realm could hardly fail

to stir resistance in the council. The king, however, was resolute, and his will was used to set aside all scruples. The judges who represented that letters-patent could not override a positive statute were forced into signing their assent by Edward's express command. To their signatures were added those of the whole council with Cranmer at its head. The primate, indeed, remonstrated, but his remonstrances proved as fruitless as those of his fellow-councilors.

645. The deed was hardly done when on the 6th of July the young king passed away. Northumberland felt little anxiety about the success of his design. He had won over Lord Hastings to his support by giving him his daughter in marriage, and had secured the help of Lord Pembroke by wedding Jane's sister, Catharine, to his son. The army, the fortresses, the foreign soldiers, were at his command; the hotter Protestants were with him; France, in dread of Mary's kinship with the emperor, offered support to his plans. Jane, therefore, was at once proclaimed queen on Edward's death, and accepted as their sovereign by the lords of the council. But the temper of the whole people rebelled against so lawless a usurpation. The eastern counties rose as one man to support Mary; and when Northumberland marched from London with 10,000 men at his back to crush the rising, the Londoners, Protestant as they were, showed their ill-will by a stubborn silence. "The people crowd to look upon us," the duke noted gloomily; "but not one calls 'God speed ye.'" While he halted for reinforcements his own colleagues struck him down. Eager to throw from

their necks the yoke of a rival who had made himself a master, the council no sooner saw the popular reaction than they proclaimed Mary queen; and this step was at once followed by a declaration of the fleet in her favor, and by the announcement of the levies in every shire that they would only fight in her cause. As the tidings reached him the duke's courage suddenly gave way. His retreat to Cambridge was the signal for a general defection. Northumberland himself threw his cap into the air and shouted with his men for Queen Mary. But his submission failed to avert his doom; and the death of the duke drew with it the imprisonment in the Tower of the hapless girl whom he had made the tool of his ambition.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### THE CATHOLIC REACTION.

1553—1558.

646. The triumph of Mary was a fatal blow at the system of despotism which Henry the Eighth had established. It was a system that rested not so much on the actual strength possessed by the crown as on the absence of any effective forces of resistance. At Henry's death the one force of opposition which had developed itself was that of the Protestants, but whether in numbers or political weight, the Protestants were as yet of small consequence, and their resistance did little to break the general drift of both

nation and king. For great as were the changes which Henry had wrought in the severance of England from the papacy and the establishment of the ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown, they were wrought with fair assent from the people at large; and when once the discontent roused by Cromwell's violence had been appeased by his fall, England as a whole acquiesced in the conservative system of the king: This national union, however, was broken by the protectorate. At the moment when it had reached its height the royal authority was seized by a knot of nobles and recklessly used to further the revolutionary projects of a small minority of the people. From the hour of this revolution a new impulse was given to resistance. The older nobility, the bulk of the gentry, the wealthier merchants, the great mass of the people, found themselves thrown by the very instinct of conservatism into opposition to the crown. It was only by foreign hirelings that revolt was suppressed; it was only by a reckless abuse of the system of packing the houses that parliament could be held in check. At last the government ventured on an open defiance of law; and a statute of the realm was set aside at the imperious bidding of a boy of fifteen. Master of the royal forces, wielding at his will the royal authority, Northumberland used the voice of the dying Edward to set aside rights of succession as sacred as his own. The attempt proved an utter failure. The very forces on which the duke relied turned against him. The whole nation fronted him in arms. The sovereign whom the voice of the young king named

as his successor passed from the throne to the Tower, and a sovereign whose title rested on parliamentary statute took her place.

647. At the opening of August, Mary entered London in triumph. Short and thin in figure, with a face drawn and colorless, that told of constant ill-health, there was little in the outer seeming of the new queen to recall her father; but her hard, bright eyes, her manlike voice, her fearlessness and self-will, told of her Tudor blood, as her skill in music, her knowledge of languages, her love of learning, spoke of the culture and refinement of Henry's court. Though Mary was thirty-seven years old, the strict retirement in which she had lived had left her as ignorant of the actual temper of England as England was ignorant of her own. She had founded her resistance to the changes of the protectorate on a resolve to adhere to her father's system till her brother came of age to rule, and England believed her to be longing, like itself, simply for a restoration of what Henry had left. The belief was confirmed by her earlier actions. The changes of the protectorate were treated as null and void. Gardiner, Henry's minister, was drawn from the Tower to take the lead as chancellor at the queen's council board. Bonner and the deposed bishops were restored to their sees, Ridley with the others who had displaced them, were again expelled, Latimer, as a representative of the extreme Protestants, was sent to the Tower; and the foreign refugees, as anti-sacramentarians, were ordered to leave England. On an indignant protest from Cranmer against reports that

he was ready to abandon the new reforms, the archbishop was sent for his seditious demeanor to the Tower, and soon put on his trial for treason, with Lady Jane Grey, her husband, and two of his brothers. Each pleaded guilty; but no attempt was made to carry out the sentence of death. In all this, England went with the queen. The popular enthusiasm hardly waited, in fact, for the orders of the government. The whole system which had been pursued during Edward's reign fell with a sudden crash. London, indeed, retained much of its Protestant sympathy, but over the rest of the country the tide of reaction swept without a check. The married priests were driven from their churches, the images were replaced. In many parishes the new prayer-book was set aside and the mass restored. The parliament which met in October annulled the laws made respecting religion during the past reign, and re-established the form of service as used in the last year of Henry the Eighth.

648. Up to this point the temper of England went fairly with that of the queen. But there were from the first signs of a radical difference between the aim of Mary and that of her people. With the restoration of her father's system the nation as a whole was satisfied. Mary, on the other hand, looked on such a restoration simply as a step toward a complete revival of the system which Henry had done away. Through long years of suffering and peril her fanaticism had been patiently brooding over the hope of restoring to England its older religion. She believed, as she said at a later time, to the parliament, that

"she had been predestined and preserved by God to the succession of the crown for no other end save that he might make use of her above all else in the bringing back of the realm to the Catholic faith." Her zeal, however, was checked by the fact that she stood almost alone in her aim, as well as by cautious advice from her cousin, the emperor; and she assured the Londoners that "albeit her own conscience was stayed in matters of religion, yet she meant not to compel or strain men's consciences otherwise than God should, as she trusted, put in their hearts a persuasion of the truth that she was in, through the opening of his word unto them by godly, and virtuous, and learned preachers." She had, in fact, not ventured as yet to refuse the title of "head of the church next under God" or to disclaim the powers which the act of supremacy gave her; on the contrary, she used these powers in the regulation of preaching, as her father had used them. The strenuous resistance with which her proposal to set aside the new prayer-book was met in parliament warned her of the difficulties that awaited any projects of radical change. The proposal was carried, but only after a hot conflict which lasted over six days and which left a third of the lower house still opposed to it. Their opposition by no means implied approval of the whole series of religious changes of which the prayer-book formed a part, for the more moderate Catholics were pleading at this time for prayers in the vulgar tongue, and on this question followers of More and Colet might have voted with the followers of Cranmer. But it showed how far men's

minds were from any spirit of blind reaction or blind compliance with the royal will.

649. The temper of the parliament, indeed, was very different from that of the houses which had knelt before Henry the Eighth. If it consented to repeal the enactment which rendered her mother's marriage invalid, and to declare Mary "born in lawful matrimony," it secured the abolition of all the new treasons and felonies created in the two last reigns. The demand for their abolition showed that jealousy of the growth of civil tyranny had now spread from the minds of the philosophers like More to the minds of common Englishmen. Still keener was the jealousy of any marked revolution in the religious system which Henry had established. The wish to return to the obedience of Rome lingered, indeed, among some of the clergy and in the northern shires. But elsewhere the system of a national church was popular, and it was backed by the existence of a large and influential class who had been enriched by the abbey lands. Forty thousand families had profited by the spoil, and watched anxiously any approach of danger to their new possessions, such as submission to the papacy was likely to bring about. On such a submission, however, Mary was resolved, and it was to gain strength for such a step that she determined to seek a husband from her mother's house. The policy of Ferdinand of Aragon, so long held at bay by adverse fortune, was now to find its complete fulfilment. To one line of the house of Austria, that of Charles the Fifth, had fallen not only the imperial crown but the great

heritage of Burgundy, Aragon, Naples, Castile, and the Castilian dependencies in the New World. To a second, that of the emperor's brother, Ferdinand, had fallen the Austrian duchies, Bohemia and Hungary. The marriage of Catharine was now, as it seemed, to bear its fruits by the union of Mary with a son of Charles, and the placing of a third Austrian line upon the throne of England. The gigantic scheme of bringing all western Europe together under the rule of a single family seemed at last to draw to its realization.

650. It was no doubt from political as well as religious motives that Mary set her heart on this union. Her rejection of Gardner's proposal that she should marry the young Courtenay, Earl of Devon, a son of the Marquis of Exeter whom Henry had beheaded, the resolve which she expressed to wed "no subject, no Englishman," was founded in part on the danger to her throne from the pretensions of Mary Stuart, whose adherents cared little for the exclusion of the Scotch line from the succession by Henry's will, and already alleged the illegitimate births of both Mary Tudor and Elizabeth, through the annulling of their mothers' marriages, as a ground for denying their right to the throne. Such claims became doubly formidable through the marriage of Mary Stuart with the heir of the French crown, and the virtual union of both Scotland and France in this claimant's hands. It was only to Charles that the queen could look for aid against such a pressure as this, and Charles was forced to give her aid. His old dreams of the mastery of the world had faded

away before the stern realities of the peace of Passau and his repulse from the walls of Metz. His hold over the empire was broken. France was more formidable than ever. To crown his difficulties the growth of heresy and of the spirit of independence in the Netherlands threatened to rob him of the finest part of the Burgundian heritage. With Mary Stuart once on the English throne, and the great island of the west knit to the French monarchy, the balance of power would be utterly overthrown, the Low Countries lost, and the imperial crown, as it could hardly be doubted, reft from the house of Austria. He was quick, therefore, to welcome the queen's advances, and to offer his son Philip, who, though not yet thirty, had been twice a widower, as a candidate for her hand.

651. The offer came weighted with a heavy bribe. The keen foresight of the emperor already saw the difficulty of holding the Netherlands in union with the Spanish monarchy; and while Spain, Naples, and Franche Comté descended to Philip's eldest son, Charles promised the heritage of the Low Countries with England to the issue of Philip and Mary. He accepted, too, the demand of Gardner and the council that in the event of such a union England should preserve complete independence both of policy and action. In any case the marriage would save England from the grasp of France, and restore it, as the emperor hinted, to the obedience of the church. But the project was hardly declared when it was met by an outburst of popular indignation. Gardner himself was against a union that would annul

the national independence which had till now been the aim of Tudor policy, and that would drag England helplessly in the wake of the house of Austria. The mass of conservative Englishmen shrank from the religious aspects of the marriage. For the emperor had now ceased to be an object of hope or confidence as a mediator who would at once purify the church from abuses, and restore the unity of Christendom; he had ranged himself definitely on the side of the papacy and of the Council of Trent; and the cruelties of the Inquisition which he had introduced into Flanders gave a terrible indication of the bigotry which he was to bequeath to his house. The marriage with Philip meant, it could hardly be doubted, a submission to the papacy, and an undoing not only of the religious changes of Edward, but of the whole system of Henry. Loyal and conservative as was the temper of the parliament, it was at one in its opposition to a Spanish marriage and in the request which it made, through a deputation of its members to the queen, that she would marry an Englishman. The request was a new step forward on the part of the houses to the recovery of their older rights. Already called by Cromwell's policy to more than their old power in ecclesiastical matters, their dread of revolutionary change pushed them to an intervention in matters of state. Mary noted the advance with all a Tudor's jealousy. She interrupted the speaker; she rebuked the parliament for taking too much on itself; she declared she would take counsel on such a matter "with God and with none other." But the remonstrance had been

made, the interference was to serve as a precedent in the reign to come, and a fresh proof had been given that parliament was no longer the slavish tool of the crown.

652. But while the nation grumbled and the parliament remonstrated, one party in the realm was filled with absolute panic by the news of the Spanish match. The Protestants saw in the marriage not only the final overthrow of their religious hopes, but a close of the religious truce, and an opening of persecution. The general opposition to the match, with the dread of the holders of church lands that their possessions were in danger, encouraged the more violent to plan a rising; and France, naturally jealous of an increase of power by its great opponent, promised to support them by an incursion from Scotland and an attack on Calais. The real aim of the rebellion was, no doubt, the displacement of Mary, and the setting either of Jane Grey, or, as the bulk of the Protestants desired, of Elizabeth, on the throne. But these hopes were cautiously hidden; and the conspirators declared their aim to be that of freeing the queen from evil counselors, and of preventing her union with the prince of Spain. The plan combined three simultaneous outbreaks of revolt. Sir Peter Carew engaged to raise the west, the Duke of Suffolk to call the midland counties to arms, while Sir Thomas Wyatt led the Kentishmen on London. The rising was planned for the spring of 1554. But the vigilance of the government drove it to a premature explosion in January, and baffled it in the center and the west. Carew fled to France;

Suffolk, who appeared in arms at Leicester, found small response from the people, and was soon sent prisoner to the Tower. The Kentish rising, however, proved a more formidable danger. A cry that the Spaniards were coming "to conquer the realm," drew thousands to Wyatt's standard. The ships in the Thames submitted to be seized by the insurgents. A party of the train-bands of London, who marched with the royal guard under the old Duke of Norfolk against them, deserted to the rebels in a mass with shouts of "A Wyatt ! a Wyatt ! we are all Englishmen !"

658. Had the Kentishmen moved quickly on the capital, its gates would have been flung open and success would have been assured. But at the critical moment Mary was saved by her queenly courage. Riding boldly to the Guildhall she appealed with "a man's voice" to the loyalty of the citizens, and denounced the declaration of Wyatt's followers as "a Spanish cloak to cover their purpose against our religion." She pledged herself, "on the word of a queen, that if it shall not probably appear to all the nobility and commons in the high court of parliament that this marriage shall be for the high benefit and commodity of all the whole realm, then will I abstain from marriage while I live." The pledge was a momentous one, for it owned the very claim of the two houses which the queen had till now haughtily rejected; and with the remonstrance of the parliament still fresh in their ears the Londoners may well have believed that the marriage project would come quietly to an end. The dread, too, of any change in religion

by the return of the violent Protestantism of Edward's day could hardly fail to win Mary support among the citizens. The mayor answered for their loyalty, and when Wyatt appeared on the Southwark bank the bridge was secured against him. But the rebel leader knew that the issue of the revolt hung on the question which side London would take, and that a large part of the Londoners favored his cause. Marching, therefore, up the Thames he seized a bridge at Kingston, threw his force across the river, and turned rapidly back on the capital. But a night march along miry roads wearied and disorganized his men; the bulk of them were cut off from their leader by a royal force which had gathered in the fields of what is now Hyde Park Corner, and only Wyatt himself with a handful of followers pushed desperately on past the palace of St. James, whence the queen refused to fly even while the rebels were marching beneath its walls, along the strand to Ludgate. "I have kept touch," he cried, as he sank exhausted at the gate. But it was closed; his adherents within were powerless to affect their promised diversion in his favor; and as he fell back the daring leader was surrounded at Temple Bar and sent to the Tower.

654. The failure of the revolt was fatal to the girl whom part at least of the rebels would have placed on the throne. Lady Jane Grey, who had till now been spared and treated with great leniency, was sent to the block; and her father, her husband, and her uncle, atoned for the ambition of the house of Suffolk by the death of traitors. Wyatt and his chief

adherents followed them to execution, while the bodies of the poorer insurgents were dangling on gibbets round London. Elizabeth, who had with some reason been suspected of complicity in the insurrection, was sent to the Tower; and only saved from death by the interposition of the council. The leading Protestants fled in terror over sea. But the failure of the revolt did more than crush the Protestant party; it enabled the queen to lay aside the mask of moderation which had been forced on her by the earlier difficulties of her reign. An order for the expulsion of all married clergy from their cures, with the deprivation of nine bishops who had been appointed during the protectorate and who represented its religious tendencies, proved the queen's resolve to enter boldly on a course of reaction. Her victory secured the Spanish marriage. It was to prevent Philip's union to Mary that Wyatt had risen, and with his overthrow the queen's policy stood triumphant. The whole strength of the conservative opposition was lost when opposition could be branded as disloyalty. Mary, too, was true to the pledge she had given that the match should only be brought about with the assent of parliament. But pressure was unscrupulously used to secure compliant members in the new elections, and a reluctant assent to the marriage was wrung from the houses when they assembled in the spring. Philip was created king of Naples by his father to give dignity to his union; and in the following July Mary met him at Winchester and became his wife.

655. As he entered London with the queen, men

noted curiously the look of the young king whose fortunes were to be so closely linked with those of England for fifty years to come. Far younger than his bride, for he was but twenty-six, there was little of youth in the small and fragile frame, the sickly face, the sedentary habits, the Spanish silence and reserve, which estranged Englishmen from Philip as they had already estranged his subjects in Italy and his future subjects in the Netherlands. Here, however, he sought by an unusual pleasantness of demeanor as well as by profuse distributions of gifts to win the national good will, for it was only by winning it that he could accomplish the work he came to do. His first aim was to reconcile England with the church. The new Spanish marriage was to repair the harm which the earlier Spanish marriage had brought about by securing that submission to Rome on which Mary was resolved. Even before Philip's landing in England the great obstacle to reunion had been removed by the consent of Julius the Third, under pressure from the emperor, to waive the restoration of the church lands in the event of England's return to obedience. Other and almost as great obstacles, indeed, seemed to remain. The temper of the nation had gone with Henry in his rejection of the papal jurisdiction. Mary's counselors had been foremost among the men who advocated the change. Her minister, Bishop Gardner, seemed pledged to oppose any submission to Rome. As secretary of state after Wolsey's fall he had taken a prominent part in the measures which brought about a severance between England and the papacy; as

Bishop of Winchester he had written a famous tract "On True Obedience," in which the papal supremacy had been expressly repudiated; and to the end of Henry's days he had been looked upon as the leading advocate of the system of a national and independent church. Nor had his attitude changed in Edward's reign. In the process for his deprivation he avowed himself ready as ever to maintain as well "the supremacy and supreme authority of the king's majesty that now is as the abolishing of the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome."

656. But with the later changes of the protectorate Gardiner had seen his dream of a national yet orthodox church vanish away. He had seen how inevitably severance from Rome drew with it a connexion with the Protestant churches and a repudiation of Catholic belief. In the hours of imprisonment his mind fell back on the old ecclesiastical order with which the old spiritual order seemed inextricably entwined, and he was ready now to submit to the papacy as the one means of preserving the faith to which he clung. His attitude was of the highest significance, for Gardiner more than any one was a representative of the dominant English opinion of his day. As the moderate party which had supported the policy of Henry the Eighth saw its hopes disappear, it ranged itself, like the bishop, on the side of a unity which could only be brought about by reconciliation with Rome. The effort of the Protestants in Wyatt's insurrection to regain their power and revive the system of the protectorate served only to give a fresh impulse to this drift of

conservative opinion. Mary, therefore, found little opposition to her plans. The peers were won over by Philip through the pensions he lavished among them, while pressure was unscrupulously used by the council to secure a compliant house of commons. When the parliament met in November these measures were found to have been successful. The attainder of Reginald Pole, who had been appointed by the pope to receive the submission of the realm, was reversed; and the legate entered London by the river with his cross gleaming from the prow of his barge. He was solemnly welcomed in full parliament. The two houses decided by a formal vote to return to the obedience of the papal see; on the assurance of Pole in the pope's name that holders of church lands should not be disturbed in their possession, the statutes abolishing papal jurisdiction in England were repealed; and lords and commons received on their knees an absolution which freed the realm from the guilt incurred by its schism and heresy.

657. But, even in the hour of her triumph, the temper both of parliament and the nation warned the queen of the failure of her hope to bind England to a purely Catholic policy. The growing independence of the two houses was seen in the impossibility of procuring from them any change in the order of succession. The victory of Rome was incomplete so long as its right of dispensation was implicitly denied by a recognition of Elizabeth's legitimacy, and Mary longed to avenge her mother by humbling the child of Anne Boleyn. But in spite of Pole's

efforts and the queen's support a proposal to oust her sister from the line of succession could not even be submitted to the houses, nor could their assent be won to the postponing the succession of Elizabeth to that of Philip. The temper of the nation at large was equally decided. In the first parliament of Mary a proposal to renew the laws against heresy had been thrown out by the lords, even after the failure of Wyatt's insurrection. Philip's influence secured the re-enactment of the statute of Henry the Fifth in the parliament which followed his arrival; but the sullen discontent of London compelled its bishop, Bonner, to withdraw a series of articles of inquiry, by which he hoped to purge his diocese of heresy, and even the council was divided on the question of persecution. In the very interests of Catholicism the emperor himself counseled prudence and delay. Philip gave the same counsel. From the moment of his arrival the young king exercised a powerful influence over the government, and he was gradually drawing into his hands the whole direction of affairs. But bigot as he was in matters of faith, Philip's temper was that of a statesman, not of a fanatic. If he came to England resolute to win the country to union with the church his conciliatory policy was already seen in the concessions he wrested from the papacy in the matter of the church lands, and his aim was rather to hold England together and to give time for a reaction of opinion than to revive the old discord by any measures of severity. It was, indeed, only from a united and contented England that he could hope for effective aid in the struggle of his house with

France, and in spite of his pledges Philip's one aim in marrying Mary was to secure that aid.

658. But, whether from without or from within, warning was wasted on the fierce bigotry of the queen. It was, as Gardiner asserted, not at the counsel of her ministers but by her own personal will that the laws against heresy had been laid before parliament; and now that they were enacted Mary pressed for their execution. Her resolve was probably quickened by the action of the Protestant zealots. The failure of Wyatt's revolt was far from taming the enthusiasm of the wilder reformers. The restoration of the old worship was followed by outbreaks of bold defiance. A tailor of St. Giles in the Fields shaved a dog with the priestly tonsure. A cat was found hanging in the Cheap, "with her head shorn, and the likeness of a vestment cast over her, with her fore-feet tied together and a round piece of paper like a singing cake between them." Yet more galling were the ballads which were circulated in mockery of the mass, the pamphlets which came from the exiles over sea, the seditious broadsides dropped in the streets, the interludes in which the most sacred acts of the old religion were flouted with ribald mockery. All this defiance only served to quicken afresh the purpose of the queen. But it was not till the opening of 1555, when she had already been a year and a half on the throne, that the opposition of her councilors was at last mastered and the persecution began. In February the deprived bishop of Gloucester, Hooper, was burned in his cathedral city, a London vicar, Lawrence Saunders, at Coven-

try, and Rogers, a prebendary of St. Paul's, at London. Ferrar, the deprived bishop of St. David's, who was burned at Caermarthen, was one of eight victims who suffered in March. Four followed in April and May, six in June, eleven in July, eighteen in August, eleven in September. In October Ridley, the deprived bishop of London, was drawn with Latimer from their prison at Oxford. "Play the man, Master Ridley!" cried the old preacher of the reformation as the flames shot up around him; "we shall this day light up such a candle by God's grace in England as I trust shall never be put out."

659. If the Protestants had not known how to govern, indeed, they knew how to die; and the cause which prosperity had ruined revived in the dark hour of persecution. The memory of their violence and greed faded away as they passed unwavering to their doom. Such a story as that of Rowland Taylor, the vicar of Hadleigh, tells us more of the work which was now begun, and of the effect it was likely to produce, than pages of historic dissertation. Taylor, who as a man of mark had been one of the first victims chosen for execution, was arrested in London, and condemned to suffer in his own parish. His wife, "suspecting that her husband should that night be carried away," had waited through the darkness with her children in the porch of St. Botolph's beside Aldgate. "Now when the sheriff his company came against St. Botolph's church, Elizabeth cried, saying, 'O my poor father! Mother! mother! here is my father led away!' Then cried his wife, 'Rowland, Rowland, where art thou?'—

for it was a very dark morning, that the one could not see the other. Dr. Taylor answered, 'I am here, dear wife,' and stayed. The sheriff's men would have led him forth, but the sheriff said, 'Stay a little, masters, I pray you, and let him speak to his wife.'" Then came she to him, and he took his daughter Mary in his arms, and he and his wife and Elizabeth knelt down and said the Lord's prayer. At which sight the sheriff wept apace, and so did divers others of the company. After they had prayed he rose up and kissed his wife and shook her by the hand, and said, 'Farewell, my dear wife, be of good comfort, for I am quiet in my conscience! God shall still be a father to my children.' . . . Then said his wife, 'God be with thee, dear Rowland! I will, with God's grace, meet thee at Hadleigh.'

660. "All the way Dr. Taylor was merry and cheerful as one that accounted himself going to a most pleasant banquet or bridal. . . . Coming within two miles of Hadleigh, he desired to light off his horse, which done he leaped and set a frisk or twain as men commonly do for dancing. 'Why, master doctor,' quote the sheriff, 'how do you now?' He answered, 'Well, God be praised, master sheriff, never better; for now I know I am almost at home. I lack not past two stiles to go over, and I am even at my Father's house!'. . . The streets of Hadleigh were beset on both sides with men and women of the town and country who waited to see him; whom when they beheld so led to death, with weeping eyes and lamentable voices, they cried, 'Ah, good Lord! there goeth our good shepherd from us!'" The jour-

ney was at last over. "'What place is this,' he asked, and what meaneth it that so much people are gathered together?' It was answered, 'It is Oldham common, the place where you must suffer, and the people are come to look upon you.' Then said he, 'Thanked be God, I am even at home!' . . . But when the people saw his reverend and ancient face, with a long white beard, they burst out with weeping tears and cried, saying, 'God save thee, good Dr. Taylor; God strengthen thee and help thee; the Holy Ghost comfort thee!' He wished, but was not suffered, to speak. When he had prayed, he went to the stake and kissed it, and set himself into a pitch-barrel which they had set for him to stand on, and so stood with his back upright against the stake, with his hands folded together and his eyes toward heaven, and so let himself be burned." One of the executioners "cruelly cast a fagot at him, which hit upon his head and brake his face that the blood ran down his visage. Then said Dr. Taylor, 'O friend, I have harm enough—what needed that?'" One more act of brutality brought his sufferings to an end. "So stood he still without either crying or moving, with his hands folded together, till Soyce with a halberd struck him on the head that the brains fell out, and the dead corpse fell down into the fire."

661. The terror of death was powerless against men like these. Bonner, the Bishop of London, to whom, as bishop of the diocese in which the council sat, its victims were generally delivered for execution, but who, in spite of the nickname and hatred

which his official prominence in the work of death earned him, seems to have been naturally a good-humored and merciful man, asked a youth who was brought before him whether he thought he could bear the fire. The boy at once held his hand without flinching in the flame of a candle that stood by. Rogers, a fellow-worker with Tyndale in the translation of the Bible, and one of the foremost among the Protestant preachers, died bathing his hands in the flame "as if it had been in cold water." Even the commonest lives gleamed for a moment into poetry at the stake. "Pray for me," a boy, William Brown, who had been brought home to Brentwood to suffer, asked of the bystanders. "I will pray no more for thee," one of them replied, "than I will pray for a dog." "'Then,' said William, 'Son of God, shine upon me;'" and immediately the sun in the elements shone out of a dark cloud so full in his face that he was constrained to look another way; whereat the people mused, because it was so dark a little time before." Brentwood lay within a district on which the hand of the queen fell heavier than elsewhere. The persecution was mainly confined to the more active and populous parts of the country, to London, Kent, Sussex, and the eastern counties. Of the two hundred and eighty whom we know to have suffered during the last three years and a half of Mary's reign, more than forty were burned in London, seventeen in the neighboring village of Stratford-le-Bow, four in Islington, two in Southwark, and one each at Barnet, St. Albans, and Ware. Kent, at that time a home of mining and manufac-

turing industry, suffered as heavily as London. Of its sixty martyrs more than forty were furnished by Canterbury, which was then but a city of some few thousand inhabitants, and seven by Maidstone. The remaining eight suffered at Rochester, Ashford, and Dartford. Of the twenty-five who died in Sussex, the little town of Lewes sent seventeen to the fire. Seventy were contributed by the eastern counties, the seat of the woolen manufacture. Beyond these districts executions were rare. Westward of Sussex we find the record of but a dozen martyrdoms, six of which were at Bristol, and four at Salisbury. Chester and Wales contributed but four sufferers to the list. In the midland counties between Thames and the Humber only twenty-four suffered martyrdom. North of the Humber we find the names of but two Yorkshiremen burned at Bedale.

662. But heavily as the martyrdoms fell on the district within which they were practically confined, and where as we may conclude Protestantism was more dominant than elsewhere, the work of terror failed in the very ends of which it was wrought. The old spirit of insolent defiance, of outrageous violence, rose into fresh life at the challenge of persecution. A Protestant hung a string of puddings round a priest's neck in derision of his beads. The restored images were grossly insulted. The old scurrilous ballads against the mass and relics were heard in the streets. Men were goaded to sheer madness by the bloodshed and violence about them. One miserable wretch, driven to frenzy, stabbed the priest of St. Margaret's as he stood with the chalice in his hand.

It was a more formidable sign of the times that acts of violence such as these no longer stirred the people at large to their former resentment. The horror of the persecution swept away all other feelings. Every death at the stake won hundreds to the cause for which the victims died. "You have lost the hearts of twenty thousands that were rank papists within these twelve months," a Protestant wrote triumphantly to Bonner. Bonner, indeed, who had never been a very zealous persecutor, was sick of his work; and the energy of the bishops soon relaxed. But Mary had no thought of hesitation in the course she had entered on, and though the imperial ambassador noted the rapid growth of public discontent, "rattling letters" from the council pressed the lagging prelates to fresh activity. Yet the persecution had hardly begun before difficulties were thickening round the queen. In her passionate longing for an heir who would carry on her religious work Mary had believed herself to be with child; but in the summer of 1555 all hopes of any childbirth passed away, and the overthrow of his projects for the permanent acquisition of England to the house of Austria at once disenchanted Philip with his stay in the realm. But even had all gone well it was impossible for the king to remain longer in England. He was needed in the Netherlands to play his part in the memorable act which was to close the emperor's political life. Already King of Naples and Lord of Milan, Philip received by his father's solemn resignation on the twenty-fifth of October the Burgundian heritage; and a month later Charles ceded to him the crowns of

Castile and Aragon with their dependencies in the New World and in the Old. The empire, indeed, passed to his uncle Ferdinand of Austria; but with this exception the whole of his father's vast dominions lay now in the grasp of Philip. Of the realms which he ruled, England was but one, and far from the greatest one, and even had he wished to return, his continued stay there became impossible.

663. He was forced to leave the direction of affairs to Cardinal Pole, who on the death of Gardiner in November, 1555, took the chief place in council. At once papal legate and chief minister of the crown, Pole carried on that union of the civil and ecclesiastical authority which had been first seen in Wolsey and had formed the groundwork of the system of Cromwell. But he found himself hampered by difficulties which even the ability of Cromwell or Wolsey could hardly have met. The embassy which carried to Rome the submission of the realm found a fresh pope, Paul the Fourth, on the throne. His accession marked the opening of a new era in the history of the papacy. Till now the fortunes of Catholicism had been steadily sinking to a lower ebb. With the peace of Passau the empire seemed lost to it. The new Protestant faith stood triumphant in the north of Germany, and it was already advancing to the conquest of the south. The nobles of Austria were forsaking the older religion. A Venetian ambassador estimated the German Catholics at little more than a tenth of the whole population of Germany. Eastward, the nobles of Hungary and Poland became Protestants in a mass. In the west, France

was yielding more and more to heresy, and England had hardly been rescued from it by Mary's accession. Only where the dead hand of Spain lay heavy, in Castile, in Aragon, or in Italy, was the reformation thoroughly crushed out; and even the dead hand of Spain failed to crush heresy in the Low Countries. But at the moment when ruin seemed certain, the older faith rallied to a new resistance. While Protestantism was degraded and weakened by the prostitution of the reformation to political ends, by the greed and worthlessness of the German princes who espoused its cause, by the factious lawlessness of the nobles in Poland and the Huguenots in France, while it wasted its strength in theological controversies and persecutions, in the bitter and venomous discussions between the churches which followed Luther and the churches which followed Zwingli or Calvin, the great communion which it assailed felt at last the uses of adversity. The Catholic world rallied round the Council of Trent. In the very face of heresy the Catholic faith was anew settled and defined. The papacy was owned afresh as the center of Catholic union. The enthusiasm of the Protestants was met by a counter enthusiasm among their opponents. New religious orders rose to meet the wants of the day; the Capuchins became the preachers of Catholicism, the Jesuits became not only its preachers but its directors, its school-masters, its missionaries, its diplomats. Their organization, their blind obedience, their real ability, their fanatical zeal, galvanized the pulpit, the school, the confessional, into a new life.

664. It was this movement, this rally of Catholi-

cism, which now placed its representative on the papal throne. At the moment when Luther was first opening his attack on the papacy, Giovanni Caraffa had laid down his sees of Chieti and Brindisi to found the order of Theatines in a little house on the Pincian hill. His aim was the reformation of the clergy, but the impulse which he gave told on the growing fervor of the Catholic world, and its issue was seen in the institution of the Capuchins and the Jesuits. Created cardinal by Paul the Third, he found himself face to face with the more liberal theologians who were longing for a reconciliation between Lutheranism and the papacy, such as Contarini and Pole, but his violent orthodoxy foiled their efforts in the conference at Ratisbon, and prevailed on the pope to trust to the sterner methods of the Inquisition. As Caraffa wielded its powers, the Inquisition spread terror throughout Italy. At due intervals groups of heretics were burned before the Dominican church at Rome; scholars like Peter Martyr were driven over sea; and the publication of an index of prohibited books gave a death-blow to Italian literature. On the verge of eighty the stern inquisitor became pope as Paul the Fourth. His conception of the papal power was as high as that of Hildebrand or Innocent the Third, and he flung contemptuously aside the system of compromise which his predecessor had been brought to adopt by the caution of the emperor. "Charles," he said, was a "favorer of heretics," and he laid to his charge the prosperity of Lutheranism in the empire. That England should make terms for its return to obedience

galled his pride, while his fanaticism would hear of no surrender of the property of the church. Philip, who had wrested the concession from Julius the Third, had no influence over a pope who hoped to drive the Spaniards from Italy, and Pole was suspected by Paul of a leaning to heresy.

665. The English ambassadors found, therefore, a rough greeting when the terms of the submission were laid before the pope. Paul utterly repudiated the agreement which had been entered into between the legate and the parliament; he demanded the restoration of every acre of church property; and he annulled all alienation of it by a general bull. His attitude undid all that Mary had done. In spite of the pompous reconciliation in which the houses had knelt at the feet of Pole, England was still unreconciled to the papacy, for the country and the pope were at issue on a matter where concession was now impossible on either side. The queen's own heart went with the pope's demand. But the first step on which she ventured toward a compliance with it showed the difficulties she would have to meet. The grant of the first-fruits to Henry the Eighth had undoubtedly rested on his claim of supremacy over the church; and now that this was at an end, Mary had grounds for proposing their restoration to church purposes. But the proposal was looked on as a step toward the resumption of the monastic lands, and after a hot and prolonged debate at the close of 1555, the commons only assented to it by a small majority. It was plain that no hearing would be given to the pope's demand for a restoration of all church prop-

erty; great lords were heard to threaten that they would keep their lands so long as they had a sword by their side; and England was thus left at hopeless variance with the papacy.

666. But difficult as Mary's task became, she clung as tenaciously as ever to her work of blood. The martyrdoms went steadily on, and at the opening of 1556 the sanction of Rome enabled the queen to deal with a victim whose death woke all England to the reality of the persecution. Far as he stood in character beneath many who had gone before him to the stake, Cranmer stood high above all in his ecclesiastical position. To burn the primate of the English church for heresy was to shut out meaner victims from all hope of escape. And on the position of Cranmer none cast a doubt. The other prelates who had suffered had been placed in their sees after the separation from Rome, and were hardly regarded as bishops by their opponents. But, whatever had been his part in the schism, Cranmer had received his pallium from the pope. He was, in the eyes of all, Archbishop of Canterbury, the successor of St. Augustine and of St. Thomas in the second see of western Christendom. Revenge, however, and religious zeal alike urged the queen to bring Cranmer to the stake. First among the many decisions in which the archbishop had prostituted justice to Henry's will stood that by which he had annulled the king's marriage with Catharine and declared Mary a bastard. The last of his political acts had been to join, whether reluctantly or no, in the shameless plot to exclude Mary from the throne. His great position

too, made Cranmer more than any man a representative of the religious revolution which had passed over the land. His figure stood with those of Henry and of Cromwell on the frontispiece of the English Bible. The decisive change which had been given to the character of the reformation under Edward was due wholly to Cranmer. It was his voice that men heard and still hear in the accents of the English liturgy.

667. As an archbishop, Cranmer's judgment rested with no meaner tribunal than that of Rome, and his execution had been necessarily delayed till its sentence could be given. It was not till the opening of 1556 that the papal see convicted him of heresy. As a heretic he was now condemned to suffer at the stake. But the courage which Cranmer had shown since the accession of Mary gave way the moment his final doom was announced. The moral cowardice which had displayed itself in his miserable compliance with the lust and despotism of Henry displayed itself again in six successive recantations by which he hoped to purchase pardon. But pardon was impossible; and Cranmer's strangely mingled nature found a power in its very weakness when he was brought into the church of St. Mary at Oxford on the 21st of March, to repeat his recantation on the way to the stake. "Now," ended his address to the hushed congregation before him,—“now I come to the great thing that troubleth my conscience more than any other thing that ever I said or did in my life, and that is the setting abroad of writings contrary to the truth; which here I now renounce and

refuse as things written by my hand contrary to the truth which I thought in my heart, and written for fear of death to save my life, if it might be. And, forasmuch as my hand offended in writing contrary to my heart, my hand therefore shall be the first punished; for if I come to the fire, it shall be the first burned." "This was the hand that wrote it," he again exclaimed at the stake, "therefore it shall suffer first punishment;" and holding it steadily in the flame "he never stirred nor cried" till life was gone.

668. It was with the unerring instinct of a popular movement that, among a crowd of far more heroic sufferers, the Protestants fixed, in spite of his recantations, on the martyrdom of Cranmer as the death-blow to Catholicism in England. For one man who felt within him the joy of Rowland Taylor at the prospect of the stake, there were thousands who felt the shuddering dread of Cranmer. The triumphant cry of Latimer could reach only hearts as bold as his own, while the sad pathos of the primate's humiliation and repentance struck chords of sympathy and pity in the hearts of all. It is from that moment that we may trace the bitter remembrance of the blood shed in the cause of Rome; which, however, partial and unjust it must seem to an historic observer, still lies graven deep in the temper of the English people. But the queen struggled desperately on. She did what was possible to satisfy the unyielding pope. In the face of the parliament's significant reluctance even to restore the first fruits to the church, she refounded all she could of the abbeys which had been suppressed. One of the greatest of these, the

Abbey of Westminster, was re-established before the close of 1556, and John Feckenham enstalled as its abbot. Such a step could hardly fail to wake the old jealousy of any attempt to reclaim the church lands, and thus to alienate the nobles and gentry from the queen. They were soon to be alienated yet more by her breach of the solemn covenant on which her marriage was based. Even the most reckless of her counselors felt the unwisdom of aiding Philip in his strife with France. The accession of England to the vast dominion which the emperor had ceded to his son in 1555, all but realized the plans of Ferdinand the Catholic for making the house of Austria master of western Christendom. France was its one effective foe; and the overthrow of France in the war which was going on between the two powers, would leave Philip without a check. How keenly this was felt at the English council-board was seen in the resistance which was made to Philip's effort to drag his new realm into the war. Such an effort was in itself a crowning breach of faith, for the king's marriage had been accompanied by a solemn pledge that England should not be drawn into the strifes of Spain. But Philip knew little of good faith when his interest was at stake. The English fleet would give him the mastery of the seas, English soldiers would turn the scale in Flanders, and at the opening of 1557 the king again crossed the channel and spent three months in pressing his cause on Mary and her advisers.

669. "He did more," says a Spanish writer of the time, "than any one would have believed possible

with that proud and indomitable nation." What he was most aided by was provocation from France. A body of refugees who had found shelter there landed in Yorkshire in the spring; and their leader, Thomas Stafford, a grandson of the late Duke of Buckingham, called the people to rise against the tyranny of foreigners and "the satanic designs of an unlawful queen." The French king hoped that a rising would give the queen work at home; but the revolt was easily crushed, and the insult enabled Mary to override her counselors' reluctance, and to declare war against France. The war opened with triumphs both on land and at sea. The junction of the English fleet made Philip master of the channel. Eight thousand men, "all clad in their green," were sent to Flanders under Lord Pembroke, and joined Philip's forces in August in time to take part in the great victory of St. Quentin. In October the little army returned home in triumph, but the gleam of success vanished suddenly away. In the autumn of 1557 the English ships were defeated in an attack on the Orkneys. In January, 1558, the Duke of Guise flung himself with characteristic secrecy and energy upon Calais and compelled it to surrender before succor could arrive. "The chief jewel of the realm," as Mary herself called it, was suddenly reft away; and the surrender of Guisnes, which soon followed, left England without a foot of land on the continent.

670. Bitterly as the blow was felt, the council, though passionately pressed by the queen, could find neither money nor men for any attempt to recover the town. The war, indeed, went steadily for Spain

and her allies; and Philip owed his victory at Gravelines in the summer of 1558 mainly to the opportune arrival of ten English ships of war, which opened fire on the flank of the French army that lay open to the sea. But England could not be brought to take further part in the contest. The levies which were being raised mutinied and dispersed. The forced loan to which Mary was driven to resort came in slowly. The treasury was drained not only by the opening of the war with France, but by the opening of a fresh strife in Ireland. To the struggle of religion which had begun there under the protectorate the accession of Mary had put an end. The shadowy form of the earlier Irish Protestantism melted quietly away. There were, in fact, no Protestants in Ireland save the new bishops; and when Bale had fled over sea from his diocese of Ossory, and his fellow-prelates had been deprived, the Irish church resumed its old appearance. No attempt, indeed, was made to restore the monasteries; and Mary exercised her supremacy, deposed or appointed bishops, and repudiated papal interference with her ecclesiastical acts as vigorously as her father. But the mass was restored, the old modes of religious worship were again held in honor, and religious dissension between the government and its Irish subjects came for the time to an end. With the close, however, of one danger came the rise of another. England was growing tired of the policy of conciliation, which had been steadily pursued by Henry the Eighth and his successor. As yet it had been rewarded with precisely the sort of success which Wolsey and Cromwell an-

ticipated. The chiefs had come quietly into the plan, and their septs had followed them in submission to the new order. "The winning of the Earl of Desmond was the winning of the rest of Munster with small charges. The making O'Brien an earl made all that country obedient." The Macwilliam became Lord Clanrickard, and the Fitzpatrick's Barons of Upper Ossory. A visit of the great northern chief who had accepted the title of Earl of Tyrone to the English court was regarded as a marked step in the process of civilization.

671. In the south, where the system of English law was slowly spreading, the chieftains sate on the bench side by side with the English justices of the peace; and something had been done to check the feuds and disorder of the wild tribes between Limerick and Tipperary. "Men may pass quietly throughout these countries without danger of robbery or other displeasure." In the Clanrickard county, once wasted with war, "plowing increaseth daily." In Tyrone and the north, however, the old disorder reigned without a check; and everywhere the process of improvement tried the temper of the English deputies by the slowness of its advance. The only hope of any real progress lay in patience; and there were signs that the government at Dublin found it hard to wait. The "rough handling" of the chiefs by Sir Edward Bellingham, a lord deputy under the Protector Somerset, roused a spirit of revolt that only subsided when the poverty of the exchequer forced him to withdraw the garrisons he had planted in the heart of the country. His successor in Mary's reign,

Lord Sussex, made raid after raid to no purpose on the obstinate tribes of the north, burning in one the cathedral of Armagh and three other churches. A far more serious breach in the system of conciliation was made when the project of English colonization which Henry had steadily rejected was adopted by the same lord deputy, and when the country of the O'Connors was assigned to English settlers and made shire-land under the names of King's and Queen's Counties, in honor of Philip and Mary. A savage warfare began at once between the planters and the dispossessed septs, a warfare which only ended in the following reign in the extermination of the Irishmen, and commissioners were appointed to survey waste lands with the aim of carrying the work of colonization into other districts. The pressure of the war against France put an end to these wider projects, but the strife in Meath went savagely on, and proved a sore drain to the exchequer.

672. Nor was Mary without difficulties in the north. Religiously as well as politically her reign told in a marked way on the fortunes of Scotland. If the queen's policy failed to crush Protestantism in England, it gave a new impulse to it in the northern realm. In Scotland the wealth and worldliness of the great churchmen had long ago spread a taste for heresy among the people; and Lollardry survived as a power north of the border long after it had almost died out to the south of it. The impulse of the Lutheran movement was seen in the diffusion of the new opinions by a few scholars, such as Wishart and Hamilton; but though Henry the Eighth pressed his

nephew James the Fifth to follow him in the work he was doing in England, it was plain that the Scotch reformers could look for little favor from the crown. The policy of the Scottish kings regarded the church as their ally against the turbulent nobles, and James steadily held its enemies at bay. The regent, Mary of Guise, clung to the same policy. But stoutly as the whole nation withstood the English efforts to acquire a political supremacy, the religious revolution in England told more and more on the Scotch nobles. No nobility was so poor as that of Scotland, and nowhere in Europe was the contrast between their poverty and the riches of the church so great. Each step of the vast spoliation that went on south of the border, the confiscation of the lesser abbeys, the suppression of the greater, the secularization of chantries and hospitals, woke a fresh greed in the baronage of the north. The new opinions soon found disciples among them. It was a group of Protestant nobles who surprised the Castle of St. Andrews and murdered Cardinal Beaton. The "Gospellers" from the Lowlands already formed a marked body in the army that fought at Pinkie Cleugh. As yet, however, the growth of the new opinions had been slow, and there had been till now little public show of resistance to the religion of the state.

673. With the accession of Mary, however, all was changed. Under Henry and Edward the Catholicism of Scotland had profited by the national opposition to a Protestant England; but now that Catholicism was again triumphant in England Protestantism became far less odious to the Scotch statesman. A

still greater change was wrought by the marriage with Philip. Such a match, securing as it did to England the aid of Spain in any future aggression upon Scotland, became a danger to the northern realm which not only drew her closer to France, but forced her to give shelter and support to the sectaries who promised to prove a check upon Mary. Many of the exiles, therefore, who left England for the sake of religion found a refuge in Scotland. Among these was John Knox. Knox had been one of the followers of Wishart; he had acted as pastor to the Protestants who, after Beaton's murder, held the Castle of St. Andrew's, and had been captured with them by a French force in the summer of 1547. The Frenchmen sent the heretics to the galleys; and it was as a galley slave in one of their vessels that Knox next saw his native shores. As the vessel lay tossing in the bay of St. Andrews, a comrade bade him look to the land, and asked him if he knew it. "I know it well," was the answer; "for I see the steeple of that place where God first in public opened my mouth to his glory; and I am fully persuaded, how weak that ever I now appear, I shall not depart this life till my tongue glorify his holy name in the same place!" It was long, however, before he could return. Released at the opening of 1549, Knox found shelter in England, where he became one of the most stirring among the preachers of the day, and was offered a bishopric of Northumberland. Mary's accession drove him again to France. But the new policy of the regent now opened Scotland to the English refugees, and it was as one of these that

Knox returned in 1555 to his own country. Although he soon withdrew to take charge of the English congregation at Frankfort and Geneva his energy had already given a decisive impulse to the new movement. In a gathering at the house of Lord Erskine he persuaded the assembly to "refuse all society with idolatry, and bind themselves to the uttermost of their power to maintain the true preaching of the evangile, as God should offer to their preachers an opportunity." The confederacy awoke anew the jealousy of the government, and persecution revived. But some of the greatest nobles now joined the reforming cause. The Earl of Morton, the head of the house of Douglass, the Earl of Argyle, the greatest chieftain of the west, and above all a bastard son of the late king, Lord James Stuart, who bore as yet the title of Prior of St. Andrews, but who was to be better known afterward as the Earl of Murray, placed themselves at the head of the movement. The remonstrances of Knox from his exile at Geneva stirred them to interfere in behalf of the persecuted Protestants; and at the close of 1557 these nobles united with the rest of the Protestant leaders in an engagement which became memorable as the first among those covenants which were to give shape and color to Scotch religion.

674. "We," ran this solemn bond, "perceiving how Satan in his members, the antichrists of our time, cruelly doth rage; seeking to overthrow and to destroy the evangel of Christ, and his congregation, ought, according to our bounden duty, to strive in our Master's cause even unto the death, being certain

of our victory in him. The which, our duty being well considered, we do promise before the majesty of God and his congregation, that we, by his grace, shall with all diligence continually apply our whole power, substance, and our very lives to maintain, set forward, and establish the most blessed word of God and his congregation, and shall labor at our possibility to have faithful ministers, purely and truly to minister Christ's evangel and sacraments to his people. We shall maintain them, nourish them, and defend them, the whole congregation of Christ and every member thereof, at our whole power and wearing of our lives, against Satan and all wicked power that does intend tyranny or trouble against the aforesaid congregation. Unto the which holy word and congregation we do join us, and also do forsake and renounce the congregation of Satan, with all the superstitious abomination and idolatry thereof; and, moreover, shall declare ourselves manifestly enemies thereto by this our faithful promise before God, testified to his congregation by our subscription at these presents."

675. The covenant of the Scotch nobles marked a new epoch in the strife of religions. Till now the reformers had opposed the doctrine of nationality to the doctrine of Catholicism. In the teeth of the pretensions which the church advanced to a uniformity of religion in every land, whatever might be its differences of race or government, the first Protestants had advanced the principle that each prince or people had alone the right to determine its form of faith and worship. "*Cujus regio,*" ran the famous phrase

which embodied their theory, "ejus religio." It was the acknowledgement of this principle that the Lutheran princes obtained at the diet of Spiers; it was on this principle that Henry based his act of supremacy. Its strength lay in the correspondence of such a doctrine with the political circumstances of the time. It was the growing feeling of nationality which combined with the growing development of monarchical power to establish the theory that the political and religious life of each nation should be one, and that the religion of the people should follow the faith of the prince. Had Protestantism, as seemed at one time possible, secured the adhesion of all the European princes, such a theory might well have led everywhere as it led in England to the establishment of the worst of tyrannies, a tyranny that claims to lord alike over both body and soul. The world was saved from this danger by the tenacity with which the old religion still held its power. In half the countries of Europe the disciples of the new opinions had soon to choose between submission to their conscience and submission to their prince; and a movement which began in contending for the religious supremacy of kings ended in those wars of religion which arrayed nation after nation against their sovereigns. In this religious revolution, Scotland led the way. Her Protestantism was the first to draw the sword against earthly rulers. The solemn "covenant" which bound together her "congregation" in the face of the regency, which pledged its members to withdraw from all submission to the religion of the state and to maintain in the face of

the state their liberty of conscience, opened that vast series of struggles which ended in Germany with the peace of Westphalia and in England with the toleration act of William the third.

676. The "covenant" of the lords sounded a bold defiance to the Catholic reaction across the border. While Mary replaced the prayer-book by the mass, the Scotch lords resolved that wherever their power extended, the common prayer should be read in all churches. While hundreds were going to the stake in England, the Scotch nobles boldly met the burning of their preachers by a threat of war. "They trouble our preachers;" ran their bold remonstrance against the bishops in the queen-mother's presence; "they would murder them and us! shall we suffer this any longer? No, madam, it shall not be!" and therewith every man put on his steel bonnet. The regent was helpless for the moment, and could find refuge only in fair words, words so fair that for a while the sternest of the reformers believed her to be drifting to their faith. She was, in truth, fettered by a need of avoiding civil strife at a time when the war of England against France made a Scotch war against England inevitable. The nobles refused, indeed, to cross the border, but the threat of a Scotch invasion was one of the dangers against which Mary Tudor now found herself forced to provide. Nor was the uprise of Protestantism in Scotland the only result of her policy in giving fire and strength to the new religion. Each step in the persecution had been marked by a fresh flight of preachers, merchants, and gentry across the seas. "Some fled into France,

some into Flanders, and some into the high countries of the empire." As early as 1554 we find groups of such refugees at Frankfort, Embden, Zürich, and Strasbourg. Calvin welcomed some of them at Geneva; the "lords of Berne" suffered a group to settle at Aarau; a hundred gathered round the Duchess of Suffolk at Wesel. Amongst the exiles we find many who were to be bishops and statesmen in the coming reign. Sir Francis Knollys was at Frankfort, Sir Francis Walsingham travelled in France; among the divines were the later Archbishops Grindal and Sandys, and the later Bishops Horne, Parkhurst, Aylmer, Jewel, and Cox. Mingled with these were men who had already played their part in Edward's reign, such as Poinet, the deprived Bishop of Winchester, Bale, the deprived Bishop of Ossary, and the preachers Lever and Knox.

677. Gardiner had threatened that the fugitives should gnaw their fingers from hunger, but ample supplies reached them from London merchants and other partisans in England, and they seem to have lived in fair comfort while their brethren at home were "going to the fire." Their chief troubles sprang from strife among themselves. The hotter spirits among the English Protestants had seen with discontent the retention of much that they looked on as superstitious and popish in even the last liturgy of Edward's reign. That ministers should still wear white surplices, that litanies should be sung, that the congregation should respond to the priest, that babes should be signed in baptism with the sign of the cross, that rings should be given in marriage,

filled them with horror. Hooper, the leader of this party, refused when made bishop to don his rochet; and had only been driven by imprisonment to vest himself in "the rags of popery." Trivial, indeed, as such questions seemed in themselves, an issue lay behind them which was enough to make men face worse evils than a prison. The royal supremacy, the headship of the church, which Henry the Eighth claimed for himself and his successors, was, as we have seen, simply an application of the principle which the states of North Germany had found so effective in meeting the pretensions of the emperor or the pope. The same sentiment of national life took a new form in the preservation of whatever the change of religious thought left it possible to preserve in the national tradition of faith and worship. In the Lutheran churches, though the mass was gone, reredos and crucifix remained untouched. In England the whole ecclesiastical machinery was jealously preserved. Its church was still governed by bishops who traced their succession to the apostles. The words of its new prayer-book adhered as closely as they might to the words of missal and breviary. What made such an arrangement possible was the weakness of the purely religious impulse in the earlier stages of the reformation. In Germany, indeed, or in England, the pressure for theological change was small; the religious impulse told on but a small part, and that not an influential part, of the population; it did, in fact, little more than quicken and bring into action the older and widely-felt passion for ecclesiastical independence.

678 But the establishment of this independence at once gave fresh force to the religious movement. From denouncing the Pope as a usurper of national rights men passed easily to denounce the papal system as in itself antichristian. In setting aside the voice of the papacy as a ground of faith, the new churches had been forced to find a ground of faith in the Bible. But the reading and discussion of the Bible opened up a thousand questions of belief and ritual, and the hatred of Rome drew men more and more to find answers to such questions which were antagonistic to the creed and usages of a past that was identified in their eyes with the papacy. Such questions could hardly fail to find an echo in the people at large. To the bulk of men ecclesiastical institutions are things dim and remote, and the establishment of ecclesiastical independence, though it gratified the national pride, could have raised little personal enthusiasm. But the direct and personal interest of every man seemed to lie in the right holding of religious truth, and thus the theological aspect of the reformation tended more and more to supersede its political one. All that is generous and chivalrous in human feeling told in the same direction. To statesmen like Gardiner or Paget the acceptance of one form of faith or worship after another as one sovereign after another occupied the throne seemed, no doubt, a logical and inevitable result of their acceptance of the royal supremacy. But to the people at large there must have been something false and ignoble in the sight of a statesman or a priest who had cast off the mass under Edward to embrace it again

under Mary, and who was ready again to cast it off at the will of Mary's successor. If worship and belief were indeed spiritual things, if they had any semblance of connection with divine realities, men must have felt that it was impossible to put them on and off at a king's caprice. It was this, even more than the natural pity which they raised, that gave their weight to the Protestant martyrdoms under Mary. They stood out in emphatic protest against the doctrine of local religion, of a belief dictated by the will of kings. From the primate of the church to the "blind girl" who perished at Colchester, 300 were found in England who chose rather to go to the fire than to take up again at the queen's will what their individual conscience had denounced as a lie against God.

679. But from the actual assertion of such a right of the individual conscience to find and hold what was true, even those who witnessed for it by their death would have shrunk. Driven by sheer force of fact from the theory of a national and royal faith, men still shuddered to stand alone. The old doctrine of a Catholic Christianity flung over them its spell. Rome, indeed, they looked on as Antichrist, but the doctrine which Rome had held so long and so firmly, the doctrine that truth should be co-extensive with the world and not limited by national boundaries, that the church was one in all countries and among all peoples, that there was a Christendom which embraced all kingdoms and a Christian law that ruled peoples and kings, became more and more the doctrine of Rome's bitterest opponents. It was

this doctrine which found its embodiment in John Calvin, a young French scholar, driven in early manhood from his own country by the persecution of Francis the First. Calvin established himself at Basle, and produced there in 1535, at the age of twenty six, a book which was to form the theology of the Huguenot churches, his "Institutes of the Christian Religion." What was really original in this work was Calvin's doctrine of the organization of the church and of its relation to the state. The basis of the Christian republic was with him the Christian man, elected and called of God, preserved by his grace from the power of sin, predestinate to eternal life. Every such Christian man is in himself a priest, and every group of such men is a church, self-governing, independent of all save God, supreme in its authority over all matters ecclesiastical and spiritual. The constitution of such a church, where each member as a Christian was equal before God, necessarily took a democratic form. In Calvin's theory of church government it is the church which itself elects its lay elders and lay deacons for purposes of administration; it is with the approval and consent of the church that elders and deacons, with the existing body of pastors, elect new ministers. It is through these officers that the church exercises its power of the keys, the power of diffusing the truth, and the power of correcting error. To the minister belong the preaching of the word and the direction of all religious instruction; to the body of ministers belong the interpretation of Scripture and the decision of doctrine. On the other hand the administration of

discipline, the supervision of the moral conduct of each professing Christian, the admonition of the erring, the excommunication and exclusion from the body of the church of the unbelieving and the utterly unworthy, belong to the consistory, the joint assembly of ministers and elders. To this discipline princes as well as common men are alike subject; princes as well as common men must take their doctrine from the ministers of the church.

680. The claims of the older faith to spiritual and ecclesiastical supremacy over the powers of earth reappeared in this theory. Calvin, like the papacy, ignored all national independence, all pretensions of peoples, as such, to create their own system of church doctrine or church government. Doctrine and government he held to be already laid down in the words of the Bible, and all questions that rose out of those words came under the decision of the ecclesiastical body of ministers. Wherever a reformed religion appeared, there was provided for it a simple but orderly organization which in its range and effectiveness rivalled that of the older Catholicism. On the other hand, this organization rested on a wholly new basis; spiritual and ecclesiastical power came from below, not from above; the true sovereign in this Christian state was not pope or bishop, but the Christian man. Despotism as the authority of pastor and elders seemed, pastors and elders were alike the creation of the whole congregation, and their judgment could in the last resort be adopted or set aside by it. Such a system stood out in bold defiance against the tendencies of the

day. On its religious side it came into conflict with that principle of nationality, of ecclesiastical as well as civil subjection to the prince, on which the reformed churches, and above all the church of England, had till now been built up. As a vast and consecrated democracy it stood in contrast with the whole social and political framework of the European nations. Grave as we may count the faults of Calvinism, alien as its temper may in many ways be from the temper of the modern world, it is in Calvinism that the modern world strikes its roots, for it was Calvinism that first revealed the worth and dignity of man. Called of God, and heir of heaven, the trader at his counter and the digger in his field suddenly rose into equality with the noble and the king.

681. It was this system that Calvin by a singular fortune was able to put into actual working in the little city of Geneva, where the party of the reformation had become master and called him in 1536 to be their spiritual head. Driven out but again recalled, his influence made Geneva from 1541 the centre of the Protestant world. The refugees who crowded to the little town from persecution in France, in the Netherlands, in England, found there an exact and formal doctrine, a rigid discipline of manners and faith, a system of church government, a form of church worship, stripped, as they held, of the last remnant of the superstitions of the past. Calvin himself, with his austere and frugal life, his enormous industry, his power of government, his quick decision, his undoubting self-confidence, his unswerving will remained, for twenty-three years, till

his death in 1564, supreme over Protestant opinion. His influence told heavily on England. From the hour of Cromwell's fall, the sympathies of the English reformers had drawn them, not to the Lutheran churches of North Germany, but to the more progressive churches of the Rhineland and the Netherlands; and, on the critical question of the Lord's supper, which mainly divided the two great branches of the reformation, Cranmer and his partisans became more definitely anti-sacramentarian as the years went by. At Edward's death the exiles showed their tendencies by seeking refuge, not with the Lutheran churches of North Germany, but with the Calvinistic churches of Switzerland or the Rhine; and contact with such leaders as Bullinger at Zürich or Calvin at Geneva, could hardly fail to give fresh vigor to the party which longed for a closer union with the foreign churches and a more open breach with the past.

682. The results of this contact first showed themselves at Frankfort. At the instigation of Whittingham, who in Elizabeth's days became Dean of Durham, a body of English exiles that had found shelter there resolved to reform both worship and discipline. The obnoxious usages were expunged from the prayer-book, omissions were made in the communion service, a minister and deacons chosen, and rules drawn up for church government after the Genevan model. Free at last "from all dregs of superstitious ceremonies," the Frankfort refugees thanked God "that had given them such a church in a strange land wherein they might hear God's

holy word preached, the sacraments rightly ministered, and discipline used, which in their own country could never be obtained." But their invitation to the other English exiles to join them in the enjoyment of these blessings met with a steady repulse. Lever and the exiles at Zürich refused to come unless they might "altogether serve and praise God as freely and uprightly as the order last taken in the church of England permitteth and presenteth, for we are fully determined to admit and use no other." The main body of the exiles who were then gathered at Strasbourg echoed the refusal. Knox, however, who had been chosen minister by the Frankfort congregation, moved rapidly forward, rejecting the communion service altogether as superstitious, and drawing up a new "order" of worship after the Genevan model. But in the spring of 1555 these efforts were foiled by the arrival of fresh exiles from England of a more conservative turn; the reformers were outvoted; Knox was driven from the town by the magistrates "in fear of the emperor," whom he had outraged in an "admonition" to the English people which he had lately issued; and the English service was restored. Whittingham and his adherents, still resolute, as Bale wrote, "to erect a church of the purity" (we may perhaps trace in the sneer the origin of their later name of Puritans) found a fresh refuge at Basle and Geneva, where the leaders of the party occupied themselves in a metrical translation of the Psalms, which left its traces on English psalmody, and in the production of what was afterward known as the Geneva Bible.

683. Petty as this strife at Frankfort may seem, it marks the first open appearance of English Puritanism, and the opening of a struggle which widened through the reign of Elizabeth till under the Stuarts it broke England in pieces. But busy as they were in strife among themselves, the exiles were still more busy in fanning the discontent at home. Books, pamphlets, broadsides, were written and sent for distribution to England. The violence of their language was incredible. No sooner had Bonner issued his injunctions than Bale denounced him in a fierce reply, as "a beastly belly-god and damnable dung-hill." With a spirit worthy of the "bloody bite-sheeps" whom he attacked, the ex-Bishop of Ossory regretted that when Henry plucked down Becket's shrine he had not burned the idolatrous priests upon it. It probably mattered little to Bale that at the moment when he wrote, not a single Protestant had as yet been sent to the stake; but language such as this was hardly likely to stir Mary to a spirit of moderation. The Spanish marriage gave the refugees a fairer opportunity of attack, and the government was forced to make inquiries of the wardens of city guilds "whether they had seen or heard of any of these books which had come from beyond seas." The violence of the exiles was doubled by the suppression of Wyatt's revolt. Toinet, the late Bishop of Winchester, who had taken part in it, fled over sea to write a "sharp tractate of political power," in which he discussed the question "whether it be lawful to depose an evil governor and kill a tyrant."

684. But with the actual outbreak of persecution

and the death of Cranmer all restraint was thrown aside. In his "First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women," Knox denounced Mary as a Jezebel, a traitress, and a bastard. He declared the rule of women to be against the law of nature and of God. The duty, whether of the estates or people of the realm, was "first to remove from honor and authority that monster in nature; secondarily, if any presume to defend that impiety, they ought not to fear, first to pronounce, then after to execute against them the sentence of death." To keep the oath of allegiance was "nothing but plain rebellion against God." "The day of vengeance," burst out the writer, "which shall apprehend that horrible monster, Jezebel of England, and such as maintain her monstrous cruelty, is already appointed in the counsel of the Eternal; and I verily believe that it is so nigh that she shall not reign so long in tyranny as hitherto she hath done, when God shall declare himself her enemy." Another exile, Goodman, inquired "how superior powers ought to be obeyed of their subjects; and wherein they may lawfully, by God's word, be disobeyed and resisted." His book was a direct summons to rebellion. "By giving authority to an idolatrous woman," Goodman wrote to his English fellow-subjects, "ye have banished Christ and his gospel. Then in taking the same authority from her you shall restore Christ and his word, and shall do well. In obeying her you have disobeyed God; then in disobeying her you shall please God." "Though it should appear at the first sight," he urged, "a great disorder that the people

should take unto them the punishment of transgressions, yet when the magistrates and other officers cease to do their duties, they are, as it were, without officers, yea, worse than if they had none at all, and then God giveth the sword into the people's hand." And what the people were to do with the sword, Poinet had already put very clearly. It was the "ungodly serpent Mary" who was "the chief instrument of all this present misery in England." "Now, both by God's laws and man's," concluded the bishop, "she ought to be punished with death, as an open idolatress in the sight of God, and a cruel murderer of his saints before men, and merciless traitress to her own native country."

685. Behind the wild rhetoric of words like these lay the new sense of a prophetic power, the sense of a divine commission given to the preachers of the Word to rebuke nobles and kings. At the moment when the policy of Cromwell crushed the church as a political power, and freed the growing monarchy from the constitutional check which its independence furnished, a new check offered itself in the very enthusiasm which sprang out of the wreck of the great religious body. Men stirred with a new sense of righteousness and of a divine government of the world, men too, whose natural boldness was quickened and fired by daily contact with the older seers who rebuked David or Jezebel, could not hold their peace in the presence of wrong. While nobles and statesmen were cowering in silence before the dreaded power of the kingship, the preachers spoke bluntly out. Not only Latimer, but Knox, Grinda-

and Lever had uttered fiery remonstrances against the plunderers of Edward's reign: Bradford had threatened them with the divine judgment which at last overtook them. "The judgment of the Lord! The judgment of the Lord!" cried he, with a lamentable voice and weeping tears. Wise or unwise, the pamphlets of the exiles only carried on this theory to its full development. The great conception of the mediæval church, that of the responsibility of kings to a spiritual power, was revived at an hour when kingship was trampling all responsibility to God or man beneath its feet. Such a revival was to have large and beneficial issues in our later history. Gathering strength under Elizabeth, it created at the close of her reign that moral force of public opinion which, under the name of Puritanism, brought the acts and policy of our kings to the tests of reason and the gospel. However ill-directed that force might be, however erroneously such tests were often applied, it is to this new force that we owe the restoration of liberty and the establishment of religious freedom. As the voice of the first Christian preachers had broken the despotism of the Roman empire, so the voice of the preachers of Puritanism broke the despotism of the English monarchy.

686. But great as their issues were to be, for the moment these protests only quickened the persecutions at home. We can hardly wonder that the arrival of Goodman's book in England in the summer of 1558 was followed by stern measures to prevent the circulation of such incentives to revolt. "Whereas divers books," ran a royal proclamation,

“filled with heresy, sedition, and treason, have of late and be daily brought into the realm out of foreign countries and places beyond seas, and some also covertly printed within this realm and cast abroad in sundry parts thereof, whereby not only God is dishonored but also encouragement is given to disobey lawful princes and governors,” any person possessing such books “shall be reported and taken for a rebel, and shall without delay be executed for that offense according to the order of martial law.” But what really robbed these pamphlets of all force for harm was the prudence and foresight of the people itself. Never, indeed, did the nation show its patient good sense more clearly than in the later years of Mary’s reign. While fires blazed in Smithfield and news of defeat came from over sea, while the hot voices of Protestant zealots hounded men on to assassination and revolt, the bulk of Englishmen looked quietly from the dying queen to the girl who in a little while must wear her crown. What nerved men to endure the shame and bloodshed about them was the certainty of the speedy succession of the daughter of Anne Boleyn. Elizabeth was now in her twenty-fifth year. Personally, she had much of her mother’s charm, with more than her mother’s beauty. Her figure was commanding, her face long but queenly and intelligent, her eyes quick and fine. She had grown up amid the liberal culture of Henry’s court a bold horsewoman, a good shot, a graceful dancer, a skilled musician, and an accomplished scholar. Even among the highly-trained women who caught the impulse of the new learning,

she stood in the extent of her acquirements without a peer. Ascham, who succeeded Grindal and Cheke in the direction of her studies, tells us how keen and resolute was Elizabeth's love of learning, even in her girlhood. At sixteen she already showed "a man's power of application" to her books. She had read almost the whole of Cicero and a great part of Livy. She began the day with the study of the New Testament in Greek, and followed this up by reading selected orations of Isocrates and the tragedies of Sophocles. She could speak Latin with fluency and Greek moderately well. Her love of classical culture lasted through her life. Amid the press and cares of her later reign we find Ascham recording how "after dinner I went up to read with the queen's majesty that noble oration of Demosthenes against Æschines." At a later time her Latin served her to rebuke the insolence of a Polish ambassador, and she could "rub up her rusty Greek" at need to bandy pedantry with a vice-chancellor. But Elizabeth was far, as yet, from being a mere pedant. She could already speak French and Italian as fluently as her mother-tongue. In later days we find her familiar with Ariosto and Tasso. The purity of her literary taste, the love for a chaste and simple style, which Ascham noted with praise in her girlhood, had not yet perished under the influence of euphuism. But even amid the affectation and love of anagrams and puerilities which sullied her later years, Elizabeth remained a lover of letters and of all that was greatest and purest in letters. She listened with delight to the "Faery Queen," and found a smile for

"Master Spenser" when he appeared in her presence.

687. From the bodily and mental energy of her girlhood, the close of Edward's reign drew Elizabeth at nineteen to face the sterner problems of religion and politics. In the daring attempt of Northumberland to place Jane Grey on the throne, Elizabeth's rights were equally set aside with those of Mary; and the first public act of the girl was to call the gentry to her standard and to join her sister with 500 followers in her train. But the momentary union was soon dissolved. The daughter of Catharine could look with little but hate on the daughter of Anne Boleyn. Elizabeth's tendency to the "new religion" jarred with the queen's bigotry; and the warnings of the imperial ambassador were hardly needful to spur Mary to watch jealously a possible pretender to her throne. The girl bent to the queen's will in hearing mass, but her manner showed that the compromise was merely a matter of obedience, and fed the hopes of the Protestant zealots who saw in the Spanish marriage a chance of driving Mary from the throne. The resolve which the queen showed to cancel her sister's right of succession only quickened the project for setting Elizabeth in her place; and it was to make Elizabeth their sovereign that Suffolk rose in Leicestershire and Wyatt and his Kentishmen marched against London bridge. The failure of the rising seemed to insure her doom. The emperor pressed for her death as a security for Philip on his arrival; and the detection of a correspondence with the French king served as a pretext

for her committal to the Tower. The fierce Tudor temper broke through Elizabeth's self-control as she landed at Traitor's gate. "Are all these harnessed men there for me?" she cried, as she saw the guard. "It needed not for me, being but a weak woman!" and passionately calling on the soldiers to "bear witness that I come as no traitor!" she flung herself down on a stone in the rain and refused to enter her prison. "Better sitting here than in a worse place," she cried; "I know not whither you will bring me." But Elizabeth's danger was less than it seemed. Wyatt denied to the last her complicity in the revolt, and in spite of Gardiner's will to "go roundly to work" with her, the lords of the council forced Mary to set her free. The queen's terrors, however, revived with her hopes of a child in the summer of 1555. To Mary, her sister seemed the one danger which threatened the succession of her coming babe and the vast issues which hung on it, and Elizabeth was summoned to her sister's side and kept a close prisoner at Hampton court. Philip joined in this precaution, for "holding her in his power he could depart safely and without peril" in the event of the queen's death in childbirth; and other plans were perhaps already stirring his breast. Should Mary die, a fresh match might renew his hold on England. "He might hope," writes the Venetian ambassador, "with the help of many of the nobility, won over by his presents and favors, to marry her (Elizabeth) again, and thus succeed anew to the crown."

688. But whatever may have been Philip's designs, the time had not as yet come for their realiza-

tion; the final disappointment of the queen's hopes for childbirth set Elizabeth free, and in July she returned to her house at Ashridge. From this moment her position was utterly changed. With the disappearance of all chance of offspring from the queen, and the certainty of Mary's coming death, her sister's danger passed away. Elizabeth alone stood between England and the succession of Mary Stuart; and, whatever might be the wishes of the queen, the policy of the house of Austria forced it to support even the daughter of Anne Boleyn against a claimant who would bind England to the French monarchy. From this moment, therefore, Philip watched jealously over Elizabeth's safety. On his departure for the continent he gave written instructions to the queen to show favor to her sister, and the charge was repeated to those of his followers whom he left behind. What guarded her even more effectually was the love of the people. When Philip, at a later time, claimed Elizabeth's gratitude for her protection, she told him bluntly that her gratitude was really due neither him nor his nobles, though she owned her obligations to both, but to the English people. It was they who had saved her from death and hindered all projects for barring her right to the throne. "It is the people," she said, "who have placed me where I am now." It was, indeed, their faith in Elizabeth's speedy succession that enabled Englishmen to bear the bloodshed and shame of Mary's later years, and to wait patiently for the end.

689. Nor were these years of waiting without value for Elizabeth herself. The steady purpose, the clear

perception of a just policy which ran through her wonderful reign, were formed as the girl looked coolly on at the chaos of bigotry and misrule which spread before her. More and more she realized what was to be the aim of her after life, the aim of reuniting the England which Edward and Mary alike had rent into two warring nations, of restoring again that English independence which Mary was trailing at the feet of Spain. With such an aim she could draw to her the men who, indifferent like herself to purely spiritual considerations, and estranged from Mary's system rather by its political than its religious consequences, were anxious for the restoration of English independence and English order. It was among these "politicals," as they were soon to be called, that Elizabeth found at this moment a counselor who was to stand by her side through the long years of her after reign. William Cecil sprang from the smaller gentry whom the changes of the time were bringing to the front. He was the son of a yeoman of the wardrobe at Henry's court; but his abilities had already raised him at the age of twenty-seven to the post of secretary to the Duke of Somerset, and through Somerset's protectorate he remained high in his confidence. He was seized by the lords on the Duke's arrest and even sent to the Tower; but he was set at liberty with his master, and his ability was now so well known that a few months later saw him secretary of state under Northumberland. The post and the knighthood which accompanied it, hardly compensated for the yoke which Northumberland's pride laid upon all who served him, or for the risks in

which his ambition involved them. Cecil saw with a fatal clearness the silent opposition of the whole realm to the system of the protectorate, and the knowledge of this convinced him that the Duke's schemes for a change in the succession were destined to failure. On the disclosure of the plot to set Mary aside he withdrew for some days from the court, and even meditated flight from the country, till fear of the young king's wrath drew him back to share in the submission of his fellow counselors, and to pledge himself with them to carry the new settlement into effect. But Northumberland had no sooner quitted London than Cecil became the soul of the intrigues by which the royal council declared themselves in Mary's favor. His desertion of the duke secured him pardon from the queen, and though he was known to be in heart "a heretic," he continued at court, conformed, like Elizabeth, to the established religion, confessed, and attended mass. Cecil was employed in bringing Pole to England, and in attending him in embassies abroad. But his caution held him aloof from any close connection with public affairs. He busied himself in building at Burghley, and in the culture of the church lands he had won from Edward the Sixth, while he drew closer to the girl who alone could rescue England from the misgovernment of Mary's rule. Even before the queen's death, it was known that Cecil would be the chief counselor of the coming reign. "I am told for certain," the Spanish ambassador wrote to Philip after a visit to Elizabeth during the last hours of Mary's life, "that Cecil, who was secretary to King Edward,

will be her secretary also. He has the character of a prudent and virtuous man, although a heretic." But it was only from a belief that Cecil retained at heart the convictions of his earlier days that men could call him a heretic. In all outer matters of faith or worship, he conformed to the religion of the state.

690. It is idle to charge Cecil, or the mass of Englishmen who conformed with him in turn to the religion of Henry, of Edward, of Mary, and of Elizabeth, with baseness or hypocrisy. They followed the accepted doctrine of the time—that every realm, through its rulers, had the sole right of determining what should be the form of religion within its bounds. What the Marian persecution was gradually pressing on such men was a conviction, not of the falsehood of such a doctrine, but of the need of limiting it. Under Henry, under Edward, under Mary, no distinction had been drawn between inner belief and outer conformity. Every English subject was called upon to adjust his conscience as well as his conduct to the varying policy of the state. But the fires of Smithfield had proved that obedience such as this could not be exacted save by a persecution which filled all England with horror. Such a persecution, indeed, failed in the very end for which it was wrought. Instead of strengthening religious unity, it gave a new force to religious separation; it enlisted the conscience of the zealot in the cause of resistance; it secured the sympathy of the great mass of waverers to those who withstood the civil power. To Cecil, as to the purely political statesman of

whom he was the type, such a persecution seemed as needless as it was mischievous. Conformity, indeed, was necessary, for men could as yet conceive of no state without a religion, or of civil obedience apart from compliance with the religious order of the state. But only outer conformity was needed. That no man should set up a worship other than that of the nation at large, that every subject should duly attend at the national worship, Cecil believed to be essential to public order. But he saw no need for prying into the actual beliefs of those who conformed to the religious laws of the realm, nor did he think that such beliefs could be changed by the fear of punishment. While refusing freedom of worship, therefore, Cecil, like Elizabeth, was ready to concede freedom of conscience. And in this concession we can hardly doubt that the bulk of Englishmen went with him. Catholics shared with Protestants the horror of Mary's persecution. To Protestantism, indeed, the horror of the persecution had done much to give a force such as it had never had before. The number of Protestants grew with every murder done in the cause of Catholicism. But they still remained a small part of the realm. What the bulk of Englishmen had been driven to by the martyrdoms was not a change of creed, but a longing for religious peace, and for such a system of government as, without destroying the spiritual oneness of the nation, would render a religious peace possible. And such a system of government, Cecil and Elizabeth were prepared to give.

691. We may ascribe to Cecil's counsels somewhat

of the wise patience with which Elizabeth waited for the coming crown. Her succession was assured, and the throng of visitors to her presence showed a general sense that the queen's end was near. Mary stood lonely and desolate in her realm. "I will not be buried while I am living, as my sister was," Elizabeth said in later years. "Do I not know how during her life every one hastened to me at Hatfield?" The bloodshed, indeed, went on more busily than ever. It had spread now from bishops and priests to the people itself, and the sufferers were sent in batches to the flames. In a single day thirteen victims, two of them women, were burned at Stratford-le-Bow. Seventy-three Protestants of Colchester were dragged through the streets of London tied to a single rope. A new commission for the suppression of heresy was exempted by royal authority from all restrictions of law which fettered its activity. But the work of terror broke down before the silent revolt of the whole nation. The persecution failed even to put an end to heretical worship. Not only do we find ministers moving about in London and Kent, to hold "secret meetings of the gospelers," but up to the middle of 1555, four parishes in Essex still persisted in using the English prayer-book. Open marks of sympathy at last began to be offered to the victims at the stake. "There were seven men burned in Smithfield the 28th day of July," a Londoner writes in 1558, "a fearful and a cruel proclamation being made that under pain of present death, no man should neither approach nigh unto them, touch them, neither speak to them, nor

comfort them. Yet were they so comfortably taken by the hand and so goodly comforted, notwithstanding that fearful proclamation and the present threatenings of the sheriffs and serjeants, that the adversaries themselves were astonished." The crowd round the fire shouted "Amen" to the martyrs' prayers, and prayed with them that God would strengthen them. What galled Mary yet more was the ill-will of the Pope. Paul the Fourth still adhered to his demand for full restoration of the church lands, and held England as only partly reconciled to the holy see. He was hostile to Philip; he was yet more hostile to Pole. At this moment he dealt a last blow at the queen, by depriving Pole of his legatine power, and was believed to be on the point of calling him to answer a charge of heresy. Even when she was freed from part of her troubles, in the autumn of 1558, by the opening of conferences for peace at Cambray, a fresh danger disclosed itself. The demands of the queen's envoys for the restoration of Calais met with so stubborn a refusal from France, that it seemed as if England would be left alone to bear the brunt of a future struggle; for Mary's fierce pride, had she lived, could hardly have bowed to the surrender of the town. But the queen was dying. Her health had long been weak, and the miseries and failure of her reign hastened the progress of disease. Already enfeebled, she was attacked, as winter drew near, by a fever, which was at this time ravaging the country, and on the 17th of November, 1558, she breathed her last.

## CHAPTER III.

## THE ENGLAND OF ELIZABETH.

1558—1561.

692. TRADITION still points out the tree in Hatfield park beneath which Elizabeth was sitting when she received the news of her peaceful accession to the throne. She fell on her knees, and drawing a long breath, exclaimed at last, "It is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes." To the last these words remained stamped on the golden coinage of the queen. The sense never left her that her preservation and her reign were the issues of a direct interposition of God. Daring and self-confident, indeed, as was her temper, it was awed into seriousness by the weight of responsibility which fell on her with her sister's death. Never had the fortunes of England sunk to a lower ebb. Dragged at the heels of Philip into a useless and ruinous war, the country was left without an ally save Spain. The loss of Calais gave France the mastery of the channel, and seemed to English eyes "to introduce the French king within the threshold of our house." "If God start not forth to the helm," wrote the council in an appeal to the country, "we be at the point of greatest misery that can happen to any people, which is to become thrall to a foreign nation." The French king, in fact, "bestrode the realm, having one foot in Calais and the other in Scotland." Ireland, too, was torn with civil war, while Scotland, always a

danger in the north, had become formidable through the French marriage of its queen. In presence of enemies such as these, the country lay helpless, without army or fleet, or the means of manning one; for the treasury, already drained by the waste of Edward's reign, had been utterly exhausted by the restoration of the church lands in possession of the crown and by the cost of the war with France. But formidable as was the danger from without, it was little to the danger from within. The country was humiliated by defeat, and brought to the verge of rebellion by the bloodshed and misgovernment of Mary's reign. The social discontent which had been trampled down for a while by the horsemen of Somerset remained a menace to further order. Above all, the religious strife had passed beyond hope of reconciliation, now that the reformers were parted from their opponents by the fires of Smithfield, and the party of the new learning all but dissolved. The more earnest Catholics were bound helplessly to Rome. The temper of the Protestants, burned at home or driven into exile abroad, had become a fiercer thing, and the Calvinistic refugees were pouring back from Geneva with dreams of revolutionary changes in church and state.

693. It was with the religious difficulty that Elizabeth was called first to deal; and the way in which she dealt with it showed at once the peculiar bent of her mind. The young queen was not without a sense of religion; at moments of peril or deliverance, throughout her reign, her acknowledgments of a divine protection took a strange depth and ear-

nestness. But she was also wholly destitute of spiritual emotion, or of any consciousness of the vast questions with which theology strove to deal. While the world around her was being swayed more and more by theological beliefs and controversies, Elizabeth was absolutely untouched by them. She was a child of the Italian renaissance rather than of the new learning of Colet or Erasmus, and her attitude toward the enthusiasm of her time was that of Lorenzo de' Medici toward Savonarola. Her mind was untroubled by the spiritual problems which were vexing the minds around her; to Elizabeth, indeed, they were not only unintelligible, they were a little ridiculous. She had been brought up under Henry amid the ritual of the older church; under Edward she had submitted to the English prayer-book, and drunk in much of the Protestant theology; under Mary she was ready after a slight resistance to conform again to the mass. Her temper remained unchanged through the whole course of her reign. She showed the same intellectual contempt for the superstition of the Romanist as for the bigotry of the Protestant. While she ordered Catholic images to be flung into the fire, she quizzed the Puritans as "brethren in Christ." But she had no sort of religious aversion from either Puritan or papist. The Protestants grumbled at the Catholic nobles whom she admitted to the presence. The Catholics grumbled at the Protestant statesmen whom she called to her council-board. To Elizabeth, on the other hand, the arrangement was the most natural thing in the world. She looked at the-

ological differences in a purely political light. She agreed with Henry the Fourth that a kingdom was well worth a mass. It seemed an obvious thing to her to hold out hopes of conversion as a means of deceiving Philip, or to gain a point in negotiation by restoring the crucifix to her chapel. The first interest, in her own mind, was the interest of public order, and she never could understand how it could fail to be the first in every one's mind.

694. One memorable change marked the nobler side of the policy she brought with her to the throne. Elizabeth's accession was at once followed by a close of the religious persecution. Whatever might be the changes that awaited the country, conformity was no longer to be enforced by the penalty of death. At a moment when Philip was presiding at autos-da-fe, and Henry of France plotting a massacre of his Huguenot subjects, such a resolve was a gain for humanity as well as a step toward religious toleration. And from this resolve Elizabeth never wavered. Through all her long reign, save a few Anabaptists, whom the whole nation loathed as blasphemers of God and dreaded as enemies to social order, no heretic was "sent to the fire." It was a far greater gain for humanity when the queen declared her will to meddle in no way with the consciences of her subjects. She would hear of no inquisition into a man's private thoughts on religious matters or into his personal religion. Cecil could boldly assert in her name at a later time the right of every Englishman to perfect liberty of religious opinion. Such a liberty of opinion by no means

implied liberty of public worship. On the incompatibility of freedom of worship with public order, Catholic and Protestant were as yet one. The most advanced reformers did not dream of contending for a right to stand apart from the national religion. What they sought was to make the national religion their own. The tendency of the reformation had been to press for the religious as well as the political unity of every state. Even Calvin looked forward to the winning of the nations to a purer faith without a suspicion that the religious movement which he headed would end in establishing the right even of the children of "Antichrist" to worship as they would in a Protestant commonwealth. If the Protestant lords in Scotland had been driven to assert a right of nonconformity, if the Huguenots of France were following their example, it was with no thought of asserting the right of every man to worship God as he would. From the claim of such a right, Knox or Coligny would have shrunk with even greater horror than Elizabeth. What they aimed at was simply the establishment of a truce till by force or persuasion they could win the realms that tolerated them for their own. In this matter, therefore, Elizabeth was at one with every statesman of her day. While granting freedom of conscience to her subjects, she was resolute to exact an outward conformity to the established religion.

695. But men watched curiously to see what religion the queen would establish. Even before her accession the keen eye of the Spanish ambassador had noted her "great admiration for the king her

father's mode of carrying on matters," as a matter of ill omen for the interests of Catholicism. He had marked that the ladies about her and the counselors on whom she seemed about to rely were, like Cecil, "held to be heretics." "I fear much," he wrote, "that in religion she will not go right." As keen an instinct warned the Protestants that the tide had turned. The cessation of the burnings, and the release of all persons imprisoned for religion, seemed to receive their interpretation when Elizabeth, on her entry into London, kissed an English Bible which the citizens presented to her, and promised "diligently to read therein." The exiles at Strasbourg or Geneva flocked home with wild dreams of a religious revolution and of vengeance upon their foes. But hopes and fears alike met a startling check. For months there was little change in either government or religion. If Elizabeth introduced Cecil and his kinsman, Sir Nicholas Bacon, to her council-board, she retained as yet most of her sister's advisers. The mass went on as before, and the queen was regular in her attendance at it. As soon as the revival of Protestantism showed itself in controversial sermons and insults to the priesthood, it was bridled by a proclamation which forbade unlicensed preaching and enforced silence on the religious controversy. Elizabeth showed, indeed, a distaste for the elevation of the host, and allowed the Lord's prayer, creed, and ten commandments to be used in English. But months passed after her accession before she would go further than this. A royal proclamation which ordered the existing form

of worship to be observed "till consultation might be had in parliament by the queen and the three estates" startled the prelates; and only one bishop could be found to assist at the coronation of Elizabeth. But no change was made in the ceremonies of the coronation; the queen took the customary oath to observe the liberties of the church, and conformed to the Catholic ritual. There was little, in fact, to excite any reasonable alarm among the adherents of the older faith, or any reasonable hope among the adherents of the new. "I will do," the queen said, "as my father did." Instead of the reforms of Edward and the protectorate, the Protestants saw themselves thrown back on the reforms of Henry the Eighth. Even Henry's system, indeed, seemed too extreme for Elizabeth. Her father had, at any rate, broken boldly from the papacy. But the first work of the queen was to open negotiations for her recognition with the papal court.

696. What shaped Elizabeth's course in fact was hard necessity. She found herself at war with France and Scotland, and her throne threatened by the claim of the girl who linked the two countries, the claim of Mary Stuart, at once queen of Scotland and wife of the Dauphin Francis. On Elizabeth's accession, Mary and Francis assumed by the French king's order the arms and style of English sovereigns; and if war continued, it was clear that their pretensions would be backed by Henry's forces as well as by the efforts of the Scots. Against such a danger, Philip of Spain was Elizabeth's only ally. Philip's policy was at this time a purely conserva-

tive one. The vast schemes of ambition which had so often knit both pope and Protestants, Germany and France, against his father were set aside by the young king. His position, indeed, was very different from that of Charles the Fifth. He was not emperor. He had little weight in Germany. Even in Italy his influence was less than his father's. He had lost, with Mary's death, the crown of England. His most valuable possessions, outside Spain, the provinces of the Netherlands, were disaffected to a foreign rule. All the king, therefore, aimed at was to keep his own. But the Netherlands were hard to keep; and with France mistress of England as of Scotland, and so mistress of the channel, to keep them would be impossible. Sheer necessity forbade Philip to suffer the union of the three crowns of the west on the head of a French king; and the French marriage of Mary Stuart pledged him to oppose her pretensions and support Elizabeth's throne. For a moment he even dreamed of meeting the union of France and Scotland by that union of England with Spain which had been seen under Mary. He offered Elizabeth his hand. The match was a more natural one than Philip's union with her sister, for the young king's age was not far from her own. The offer, however, was courteously put aside, for Elizabeth had no purpose of lending England to the ambition of Spain, nor was it possible for her to repeat her sister's unpopular experiment. But Philip remained firm in his support of her throne. He secured for her the allegiance of the Catholics within her realm, who looked to him as

their friend, while they distrusted France as an ally of heretics. His envoys supported her cause in the negotiations at Câteau Cambrésis; he suffered her to borrow money and provide herself with arms in his provinces of the Netherlands. At such a crisis, Elizabeth could not afford to alienate Philip by changes which would roughly dispel his hopes of retaining her within the bounds of Catholicism.

697. Nor is there any sign that Elizabeth had resolved on a defiance of the papacy. She was firm, indeed, to assert her father's claim of supremacy over the clergy and her own title to the throne. But the difficulties in the way of an accommodation on these points were such as could be settled by negotiation; and, acting on Cecil's counsel, Elizabeth announced her accession to the pope. The announcement showed her purpose of making no violent break in the relations of England with the papal see. But between Elizabeth and the papacy lay the fatal question of the divorce. To acknowledge the young queen was not only to own her mother's marriage, but to cancel the solemn judgment of the holy see in Catharine's favor, and its solemn assertion of her own bastardy. The temper of Paul the Fourth took fire at the news. He reproached Elizabeth with her presumption in ascending the throne, recalled the papal judgment which pronounced her illegitimate, and summoned her to submit her claims to his tribunal. Much of this indignation was, no doubt, merely diplomatic. If the pope listened to the claims of Mary Stuart, which were urged on him by the French court, it was probably only with the purpose of using them

to bring pressure to bear on Elizabeth and on the stubborn country which still refused to restore its lands to the church, and to make the complete submission which Paul demanded. But Cecil and the queen knew that, even had they been willing to pay such a price for the crown, it was beyond their power to bring England to pay it. The form, too, in which Paul had couched his answer admitted of no compromise. The summons to submit the queen's claim of succession to the judgment of Rome produced its old effect. Elizabeth was driven, as Henry had been driven, to assert the right of the nation to decide on questions which affected its very life. A parliament which met in January, 1559, acknowledged the legitimacy of Elizabeth and her title to the crown.

698. Such an acknowledgment in the teeth of the papal repudiation of Anne Boleyn's marriage carried with it a repudiation of the supremacy of the papacy. It was in vain that the clergy in convocation unanimously adopted five articles which affirmed their faith in transubstantiation, their acceptance of the supreme authority of the popes as "Christ's vicars and supreme rulers of the church," and their resolve "that the authority in all matters of faith and discipline belongs and ought to belong only to the pastors of the church, and not to laymen." It was in vain that the bishops unanimously opposed the bill for restoring the royal supremacy when it was brought before the lords. The "ancient jurisdiction of the crown over the estate ecclesiastical and spiritual" was restored; the acts which under Mary re-established the independent jurisdiction and legis-

lation of the church were repealed; and the clergy were called on to swear to the supremacy of the crown, and to abjure all foreign authority and jurisdiction. Further Elizabeth had no personal wish to go. A third of the council, and at least two-thirds of the people, were as opposed to any radical changes in religion as the queen. Among the gentry, the older and wealthier were on the conservative side, and only the younger and meaner on the other. In the parliament itself Sir Thomas White protested that "it was unjust that a religion begun in such a miraculous way and established by such grave men should be abolished by a set of beardless boys." Yet even this "beardless" parliament had shown a strong conservatism. The bill which re-established the royal supremacy met with violent opposition in the commons, and only passed through Cecil's adroit maneuvering.

699. But the steps which Elizabeth had taken made it necessary to go further. If the Protestants were the less numerous, they were the abler and the more vigorous party, and the break with Rome threw Elizabeth, whether she would or no, on their support. It was a support that could only be bought by theological concessions, and, above all, by the surrender of the mass; for every Protestant the mass was identified with the fires of Smithfield, while the prayer-book which it had displaced was hallowed by the memories of the martyrs. The pressure of the reforming party, indeed, would have been fruitless had the queen still been hampered by danger from France. Fortunately for their cause, the treaty of Câteau

Cambr sis at this juncture freed Elizabeth's hands. By this treaty, which was practically concluded in March, 1559, Calais was left in French holding, on the illusory pledge of its restoration to England eight years later; but peace was secured and the danger of a war of succession, in which Mary Stuart would be backed by the arms of France, for a while averted. Secure from without, Elizabeth could venture to buy the support of the Protestants within her realm by the restoration of the English prayer-book. Such a measure was far, indeed, from being meant as an open break with Catholicism. The use of the vulgar tongue in public worship was still popular with a large part of the Catholic world; and the queen did her best by the alterations she made in Edward's prayer-book to strip it of its more Protestant tone. To the bulk of the people the book must have seemed merely a rendering of the old service in their own tongue. As the English Catholics afterward represented at Rome when excusing their own use of it, the prayer-book "contained neither impiety nor false doctrine; its prayers were those of the Catholic church, altered only so far as to omit the merits and intercession of the saints." On such a concession as this the queen felt it safe to venture in spite of the stubborn opposition of the spiritual estate. She ordered a disputation to be held in Westminster Abbey before the houses on the question; and when the disputation ended in the refusal of the bishops to proceed, an act of uniformity, which was passed in spite of their strenuous opposition, restored at the close of April the last prayer-book of Edward, and

enforced its use on the clergy on pain of deprivation.

700. At Rome the news of these changes stirred a fiercer wrath in Paul the Fourth, and his threats of excommunication were only held in check by the protests of Philip. The policy of the Spanish king still bound him to Elizabeth's cause, for the claims of Mary Stuart had been reserved in the treaty of Câteau Cambrésis, and the refusal of France to abandon them held Spain to its alliance with the queen. Vexed as he was at the news of the acts which re-established the supremacy, Philip ordered his ambassador to assure Elizabeth he was as sure a friend as ever, and to soothe the resentment of the English Catholics if it threatened to break out into revolt. He showed the same temper in his protest against action at Rome. Paul had, however, resolved to carry out his threats, when his death and the interregnum which followed gave Elizabeth a fresh respite. His successor, Pius the Fourth, was of milder temper and leaned rather to a policy of conciliation. Decisive, indeed, as the queen's action may seem in modern eyes, it was far from being held as decisive at the time. The act of supremacy might be regarded as having been forced upon Elizabeth by Paul's repudiation of her title to the crown. The alterations which were made by the queen's authority in the prayer-book showed a wish to conciliate those who clung to the older faith. It was clear that Elizabeth had no mind merely to restore the system of the protectorate. She set up again the royal supremacy, but she dropped the words "head of the church" from the royal title. The forty-two articles of Prot-

estant doctrine which Cranmer had drawn up were left in abeyance. If the queen had had her will, she would have retained the celibacy of the clergy and restored the use of crucifixes in the churches.

701. The caution and hesitation with which she enforced on the clergy the oath required by the act of supremacy showed Elizabeth's wish to avoid the opening of a religious strife. The higher dignitaries, indeed, were unsparingly dealt with. The bishops, who with a single exception refused to take the oath, were imprisoned and deprived. The same measure was dealt out to most of the archdeacons and deans. But with the mass of the parish priests a very different course was taken. The commissioners appointed in May, 1559, were found to be too zealous in October, and several of the clerical members were replaced by cooler laymen. The great bulk of the clergy seem neither to have refused nor to have consented to the oath, but to have left the commissioners' summons unheeded and to have stayed quietly at home. Of the 9,400 beneficed clergy, only a tenth presented themselves before the commissioners. Of those who attended and refused the oath 189 were deprived, but many of the most prominent went unharmed. At Winchester, though the dean and canons of the cathedral, the warden and fellows of the college, and the master of St. Cross refused the oath, only four of these appear in the list of deprivations. Even the few who suffered proved too many for the purpose of the queen. In the more remote parts of the kingdom the proceedings of the visitors threatened to wake the religious strife which she was

endeavoring to lull to sleep. On the northern border, where the great nobles, Lord Dacres and the Earls of Cumberland and Westmoreland, were zealous Catholics, and refused to let the bishop "meddle with them," the clergy held stubbornly aloof. At Durham a parson was able to protest without danger that the pope alone had power in spiritual matters. In Hereford, the town turned out to receive in triumph a party of priests from the west who had refused the oath. The University of Oxford took refuge in sullen opposition. In spite of pressure from the Protestant prelates, who occupied the sees vacated by the deprived bishops, Elizabeth was firm in her policy of patience, and in December she ordered the commissioners in both provinces to suspend their proceedings.

703. In part, indeed, of her effort she was foiled by the bitterness of the reformers. The London mob tore down the crosses in the streets. Her attempt to retain the crucifix, or to enforce the celibacy of the priesthood, fell dead before the opposition of the Protestant clergy. But to the mass of the nation, the compromise of Elizabeth seems to have been fairly acceptable. They saw but little change. Their old vicar or rector in almost every case remained in his parsonage and ministered in his church. The new prayer-book was for the most part an English rendering of the old service. Even the more zealous adherents of Catholicism held as yet that in complying with the order for attendance at public worship "there could be nothing positively unlawful." Where party feeling ran high, indeed, the matter

was sometimes settled by a compromise. A priest would celebrate mass at his parsonage for the more rigid Catholics, and administer the new communion in church to the more rigid Protestants. Sometimes both parties knelt together at the same altar-rails, the one to receive hosts consecrated by the priest at home after the old usage, the other wafers consecrated in church after the new. In many parishes of the north no change of service was made at all. Even where priest and people conformed, it was often with a secret belief that better times were soon to bring back the older observances. As late as 1569, some of the chief parishes in Sussex were still merely bending to the storm of heresy. "In the church of Arundel certain altars do stand yet, to the offense of the godly, which murmur and speak much against the same. In the town of Battle, when a preacher doth come and speak anything against the pope's doctrine, they will not abide but get them out of the church. They have yet, in the diocese, in many places thereof, images hidden, and other popish ornaments, ready to set up the mass again within twenty-four hours' warning. In many places they keep yet their chalices, looking to have mass again." Nor was there much new teaching as yet to stir up strife in those who clung to the older faith. Elizabeth had no mind for controversies which would set her people by the ears. "In many churches they have no sermons, not one in seven years, and some not one in twelve." The older priests of Mary's days held their peace. The Protestant preachers were few, and hampered by the exaction of licenses. In many cases

churches had "neither parson, vicar, nor curate, but a sorry reader." Even where the new clergy were of higher intellectual stamp they were often unpopular. Many of those who were set in the place of the displaced clergy roused disgust by their violence and greed. Chapters plundered their own estates by leases and fines and by felling timber. The marriages of the clergy became a scandal, which was increased when the gorgeous vestments of the old worship were cut up into gowns and bodices for the priests' wives. The new services sometimes turned into scenes of utter disorder where the ministers wore what dress they pleased, and the communicant stood or sat as he liked; while the old altars were broken down and the communion-table was often a bare board upon trestles. Only in the few places where the more zealous of the reformers had settled was there any religious instruction. "In many places," it was reported after ten years of the queen's rule, "the people cannot yet say their commandments, and in some not the articles of their belief." Naturally enough, the bulk of Englishmen were found to be "utterly devoid of religion," and came to church "as to a May game."

703. To modern eyes the church under Elizabeth would seem little better than a religious chaos. But England was fairly used to religious confusion, for the whole machinery of English religion had been thrown out of gear by the rapid and radical changes of the last two reigns. And to the queen's mind a religious chaos was a far less difficulty than the parting of the nation into two warring churches which

would have been brought about by a more rigorous policy. She trusted to time to bring about greater order; and she found in Matthew Parker, whom Pole's death at the moment of her accession enabled her to raise to the see of Canterbury, an agent in the reorganization of the church whose patience and moderation were akin to her own. To the difficulties which Parker found, indeed, in the temper of the reformers and their opponents new difficulties were sometimes added by the freaks of the queen herself. If she had no convictions, she had tastes; and her taste revolted from the bareness of Protestant ritual, and above all from the marriage of priests. "Leave that alone," she shouted to Dean Nowell from the royal closet as he denounced the use of images—"stick to your text, master dean, leave that alone!" When Parker was firm in resisting the introduction of the crucifix or of celibacy, Elizabeth showed her resentment by an insult to his wife. Married ladies were addressed at this time as "madam," unmarried ladies as "mistress;" but the marriage of the clergy was still unsanctioned by law, for Elizabeth had refused to revive the statute of Edward by which it was allowed, and the position of a priest's wife was legally a very doubtful one. When Mrs. Parker, therefore, advanced at the close of a sumptuous entertainment at Lambeth to take leave of the queen, Elizabeth feigned a momentary hesitation. "Madam," she said at last, "I may not call you, and mistress I am loath to call you; however, I thank you for your good cheer." But freaks of this sort had little real weight beside the steady support which

the queen gave to the primate in his work of order. The vacant sees were filled with men from among the exiles, for the most part learned and able, though far more Protestant than the bulk of their flocks; the plunder of the church by the nobles was checked; and at the close of 1559, England seemed to settle quietly down in a religious peace.

704. But cautious as had been Elizabeth's movements, and skillfully as she had hidden the real drift of her measures from the bulk of the people, the religion of England was changed. The old service was gone. The old bishops were gone. The royal supremacy was again restored. All connection with Rome was again broken. The repudiation of the papacy and the restoration of the prayer-book in the teeth of the unanimous opposition of the priesthood had established the great principle of the reformation, that the form of a nation's faith should be determined not by the clergy but by the nation itself. Different, therefore, as was the temper of the government, the religious attitude of England was once more what it had been under the protectorate. At the most critical moment of the strife between the new religion and the old, England had ranged itself on the side of Protestantism. It was only the later history of Elizabeth's reign which was to reveal of what mighty import this Protestantism of England was to prove. Had England remained Catholic, the freedom of the Dutch republic would have been impossible. No Henry the Fourth would have reigned in France to save French Protestantism by the edict of Nantes. No struggle over far-off seas would have

broken the power of Spain, and baffled the hopes which the house of Austria cherished of winning a mastery over the western world. Nor could Calvinism have found a home across the northern border. The first result of the religious change in England was to give a new impulse to the religious revolution in Scotland.

705. In the midst of anxieties at home, Elizabeth had been keenly watching the fortunes of the north. We have seen how the policy of Mary of Guise had given life and force to the Scottish reformation. Not only had the regent given shelter to the exiled Protestants, and looked on at the diffusion of the new doctrines, but her "fair words" had raised hopes that the government itself would join the ranks of the reformers. Mary of Guise had looked on the religious movement in a purely political light. It was as enemies of Mary Tudor that she gave shelter to the exiles, and it was to avoid a national strife which would have left Scotland open to English attack in the war which closed Mary's reign that the regent gave "fair words" to the preachers. But with the first covenant, with the appearance of the lords of the congregation in an avowed league in the heart of the land, with their rejection of the state worship and their resolve to enforce a change of religion, her attitude suddenly altered. To the regent the new religion was henceforth but a garb under which the old quarrel of the nobles was breaking out anew against the crown. Smooth as were her words, men knew that Mary of Guise was resolute to withstand religious change. But Elizabeth's elevation to the throne gave a new fire

to the reformers. Conservative as her earlier policy seemed, the instinct of the Protestants told them that the new queen's accession was a triumph for Protestantism. The lords at once demanded that all bishops should be chosen by the nobles and gentry, each priest by his parish, and that divine service should be henceforth in the vulgar tongue. These demands were rejected by the bishops, while the royal court, in May, 1559, summoned the preachers to its bar, and on their refusal to appear condemned them to banishment as rebels. The sentence was a signal for open strife. The Protestants, whose strength as yet lay mainly in Fife, had gathered in great numbers at Perth, and the news stirred them to an outbreak of fury. The images were torn down from the churches, the monasteries of the town were sacked and demolished. The riot at Perth was followed by a general rising. The work of destruction went on along the east coast and through the Lowlands, while the "congregation" sprang up everywhere in its train. The mass came to an end. The prayer-book of Edward was heard in the churches. The lords occupied the capital and found its burghers as zealous in the cause of reformation as themselves. Throughout all these movements the lords had been in communication with England, for the old jealousy of English annexation was now lost in a jealousy of French conquest. Their jealousy had solid grounds. The marriage of Mary Stuart with the dauphin of France had been celebrated in April, 1558, and three days before the wedding the girl-queen had been brought to convey her kingdom away by deed to the house of

Valois. The deed was kept secret; but Mary's demand of the crown matrimonial for her husband roused suspicions. It was known that the government of Scotland was discussed at the French council board, and whispers came of a suggestion that the kingdom should be turned into an appanage for a youngson of the French king. Meanwhile, French money was sent to the regent, a body of French troops served as her body-guard, and on the advance of the lords in arms the French court promised her the support of a larger army.

706. Against these schemes of the French court the Scotch lords saw no aid save in Elizabeth. Their aim was to drive the Frenchmen out of Scotland; and this could only be done by help both in money and men from England. Nor was the English council slow to promise help. To Elizabeth, indeed, the need of supporting rebels against their sovereign was a bitter one. The need of establishing a Calvinistic church on her frontier was yet bitterer. It was not a national force which upheld the fabric of the monarchy, as it had been built up by the houses of York and of Tudor, but a moral force. England held that safety against anarchy within and against attacks on the national independence from without was to be found in the crown alone, and that obedience to the crown was the first element of national order and national greatness. In their religious reforms the Tudor sovereigns had aimed at giving a religious sanction to the power which sprang from this general conviction, and at hallowing their secular supremacy by blending with it their supremacy

over the church. Against such a theory, either of church or state, Calvinism was an emphatic protest, and in aiding Calvinism to establish itself in Scotland, the queen felt that she was dealing a heavy blow to her political and religious system at home. But struggle as she might against the necessity, she had no choice but to submit. The assumption by Francis and Mary of the style of king and queen of England, the express reservation of this claim, even in the treaty of Câteau Cambrésis, made a French occupation of Scotland a matter of life and death to the kingdom over the border. The English council believed "that the French mean, after their forces are brought into Scotland, first to conquer it—which will be neither hard nor long—and next that they and the Scots will invade this realm." They were soon pressed to decide on their course. The regent used her money to good purpose, and at the approach of her forces the lords withdrew from Edinburgh to the west. At the end of August 2,000 French soldiers landed at Leith, as the advance-guard of the promised force, and intrenched themselves strongly. It was in vain that the lords again appeared in the field, demanded the withdrawal of the foreigners, and threatened Mary of Guise that as she would no longer hold them for her counselors, "we also will no longer acknowledge you as our regent." They were ordered to disperse as traitors, beaten off from the fortifications of Leith, and attacked by the French troops in Fife itself.

707. The lords called loudly for aid from the English queen. To give such assistance would have

seemed impossible but twelve months back. But the appeal of the Scots found a different England from that which had met Elizabeth on her accession. The queen's diplomacy had gained her a year, and her matchless activity had used the year to good purpose. Order was restored throughout England, the church was reorganized, the debts of the crown were in part paid off, the treasury was recruited, a navy created, and a force made ready for action in the north. Neither religiously nor politically, indeed, had Elizabeth any sympathy with the Scotch lords. Knox was to her simply a firebrand of rebellion; her political instinct shrank from the Scotch Calvinism, with its protest against the whole English system of government, whether in church or state; and as a queen she hated revolt. But the danger forced her hand. Elizabeth was ready to act, and to act even in the defiance of France. As yet she stood almost alone in her self-reliance. Spain believed her ruin to be certain. Her challenge would bring war with France, and in a war with France the Spanish statesmen held that only their master's intervention could save her. "For our own sake," said one of Philip's ministers, "we must take as much care of England as of the Low Countries." But that such a care would be needed, Grenville never doubted; and Philip's counselors solemnly debated whether it might not be well to avoid the risk of a European struggle by landing the 6,000 men whom Philip was now withdrawing from the Netherlands on the English shore and coercing Elizabeth into quietness. France, meanwhile, despised her chances. Her very

council was in despair. The one minister in whom she dared to confide throughout these Scotch negotiations was Cecil, the youngest and boldest of her advisers, and even Cecil trembled for her success. The Duke of Norfolk refused at first to take command of the force destined, as he held, for a desperate enterprise. Arundel, the leading peer among the Catholics, denounced the supporters of a Scottish war as traitors. But lies and hesitation were no sooner put aside than the queen's vigor and tenacity came fairly into play. In January, 1560, at a moment when D'Oysel, the French commander, was on the point of crushing the lords of the congregation, an English fleet appeared suddenly in the Forth and forced the regent's army to fall back upon Leith.

708. Here, however, it again made an easy stand against the Protestant attacks, and at the close of February the queen was driven to make a formal treaty with the lords, by which she promised to assist them in the expulsion of the strangers. The treaty was a bold defiance of the power from whom Elizabeth had been glad to buy peace only a year before, even by the sacrifice of Calais. But the queen had little fear of a counter-blow from France. The reformation was fighting for her on the one side of the sea as on the other. From the outset of her reign the rapid growth of the Huguenots in France had been threatening a strife between the old religion and the new. It was to gird himself for such a struggle that Henry the Second concluded the treaty of Câteau Cambrésis; and though Henry's projects were foiled by his death, the Duke of Guise, who

ruled his successor, Francis the Second, pressed on yet more bitterly the work of persecution. It was believed that he had sworn to exterminate "those of the religion." But the Huguenots were in no mood to bear extermination. Their Protestantism, like that of the Scots, was the Protestantism of Calvin. As they grew in numbers, their churches formed themselves on the model of Geneva, and furnished in their synods and assemblies a political as well as a religious organization; while the doctrine of resistance even to kings, if kings showed themselves enemies to God, found ready hearers, whether among the turbulent French noblesse or among the traders of the towns who were stirred to new dreams of constitutional freedom. Theories of liberty or of resistance to the crown were as abhorrent to Elizabeth as to the Guises, but again necessity swept her into the current of Calvinism. She was forced to seize on the religious disaffection of France as a check on the dreams of aggression which Francis and Mary had shown in assuming the style of English sovereigns. The English ambassador, Throckmorton, fed the alarms of the Huguenots and pressed them to take up arms. It is probable that the Huguenot plot which broke out in the March of 1560 in an attempt to surprise the French court at Amboise was known beforehand by Cecil; and, though the conspiracy was ruthlessly suppressed, the queen drew fresh courage from a sense that the Guises had henceforth work for their troops at home.

709. At the end of March, therefore, Lord Grey pushed over the border with 8,000 men to join the

lords of the congregation in the siege of Leith. The Scots gave little aid; and an assault on the town signally failed. Philip, too, in a sudden jealousy of Elizabeth's growing strength, demanded the abandonment of the enterprise, and offered to warrant England against any attack from the north if its forces were withdrawn. But eager as Elizabeth was to preserve Philip's alliance, she preferred to be her own security. She knew that the Spanish king could not abandon her while Mary Stuart was queen of France, and that at the moment of his remonstrances Philip was menacing the Guises with war if they carried out their project of bringing about a Catholic rising by a descent on the English coast. Nor were the threats of the French court more formidable. The bloody repression of the conspiracy of Amboise had only fired the temper of the Huguenots; southern and western France were on the verge of revolt; the house of Bourbon had adopted the reformed faith, and put itself at the head of the Protestant movement. In the face of dangers such as these, the Guises could send to Leith neither money nor men. Elizabeth, therefore, remained immovable while famine did its work on the town. At the crisis of the siege the death of Mary of Guise threw the direct rule over Scotland into the hands of Francis and Mary Stuart; and the exhaustion of the garrison forced the two sovereigns to purchase its liberation by two treaties which their envoys concluded at Edinburgh, in June, 1560. That with the Scotch pledged them to withdraw forever the French from the realm, and left the

government of Scotland to a council of the lords. The treaty with England was a more difficult matter. Francis and Mary had forbidden their envoys to sign any engagement with Elizabeth as to the Scottish realm, or to consent to any abandonment of their claims on the royal style of England. It was only after long debate that Cecil wrested from them the acknowledgment that the realms of England and Ireland of right appertained to Elizabeth, and a vague clause by which the French sovereigns promised the English queen that they would fulfill their pledges to the Scots.

710. Stubborn, however, as was the resistance of the French envoys, the signature of the treaty proclaimed Elizabeth's success. The issue of the Scotch war revealed suddenly to Europe the vigor of the queen and the strength of her throne. What her ability really was no one, save Cecil, had as yet suspected. There was little, indeed, in her outward demeanor to give any indication of her greatness. To the world about her, the temper of Elizabeth recalled in its strange contrasts the mixed blood within her veins. She was at once the daughter of Henry and of Anne Boleyn. From her father she inherited her frank and hearty address, her love of popularity and of free intercourse with the people, her dauntless courage, and her amazing self-confidence. Her harsh, manlike voice, her impetuous will, her pride, her furious outbursts of anger, came to her with her Tudor blood. She rated great nobles as if they were school-boys; she met the insolence of Lord Essex with a box on the ear; she broke now and then into

the gravest deliberations to swear at her ministers like a fishwife. Strangely in contrast with these violent outlines of her father's temper stood the sensuous, self-indulgent nature she drew from Anne Boleyn. Splendor and pleasure were with Elizabeth the very air she breathed. Her delight was to move in perpetual progresses from castle to castle through a series of gorgeous pageants, fanciful and extravagant as a caliph's dream. She loved gayety, and laughter, and wit. A happy retort or a finished compliment never failed to win her favor. She hoarded jewels. Her dresses were innumerable. Her vanity remained, even to old age, the vanity of a coquette in her teens. No adulation was too fulsome for her, no flattery of her beauty too gross. She would play with her rings that her courtiers might note the delicacy of her hands; or dance a coranto that an ambassador, hidden dexterously behind a curtain, might report her sprightliness to his master. Her levity, her frivolous laughter, her unwomanly jests, gave color to a thousand scandals. Her character, in fact, like her portraits, was utterly without shade. Of womanly reserve or self-restraint she knew nothing. No instinct of delicacy veiled the voluptuous temper which broke out in the romps of her girlhood and showed itself almost ostentatiously through her later life. Personal beauty in a man was a sure passport to her liking. She patted handsome young squires on the neck when they knelt to kiss her hand, and fondled her "sweet Robin," Lord Leicester, in the face of the court.

711. It was no wonder that the statesmen whom

she outwitted held Elizabeth to be little more than a frivolous woman, or that Phillip of Spain wondered how "a wanton" could hold in check the policy of the Escorial. But the Elizabeth whom they saw was far from being all of Elizabeth. Willfulness and triviality played over the surface of a nature hard as steel, a temper purely intellectual, the very type of reason untouched by imagination or passion. Luxurious and pleasure-loving as she seemed, the young queen lived simply and frugally, and she worked hard. Her vanity and caprice had no weight whatever with her in state affairs. The coquette of the presence-chamber became the coolest and hardest of politicians at the council-board. Fresh from the flattery of her courtiers, she would tolerate no flattery in the closet; she was herself plain and downright of speech with her counselors, and she looked for a corresponding plainness of speech in return. The very choice of her advisers, indeed, showed Elizabeth's ability. She had a quick eye for merit of any sort, and a wonderful power of enlisting its whole energy in her service. The sagacity which chose Cecil and Walsingham was just as unerring in its choice of the meanest of her agents. Her success, indeed, in securing from the beginning of her reign to its end, with the single exception of Leicester, precisely the right men for the work she set them to do, sprang in great measure from the noblest characteristic of her intellect. If in loftiness of aim the queen's temper fell below many of the tempers of her time, in the breadth of its range, in the univer-

sality of its sympathy, it stood far above them all. Elizabeth could talk poetry with Spenser and philosophy with Bruno; she could discuss euphuism with Lilly, and enjoy the chivalry of Essex; she could turn from talk of the last fashions to pore with Cecil over dispatches and treasury-books; she could pass from tracking traitors with Walsingham to settle points of doctrine with Parker, or to calculate with Frobisher the chances of a north-west passage to the Indies. The versatility and many-sidedness of her mind enabled her to understand every phase of the intellectual movement about her, and to fix by a sort of instinct on its higher representatives.

712. It was only on its intellectual side, indeed, that Elizabeth touched the England of her day. All its moral aspects were simply dead to her. It was a time when men were being lifted into nobleness by the new moral energy which seemed suddenly to pulse through the whole people, when honor and enthusiasm took colors of poetic beauty, and religion became a chivalry. But the finer sentiments of the men about her touched Elizabeth simply as the fair tints of a picture would have touched her. She made her market with equal indifference out of the heroism of William of Orange or the bigotry of Philip. The noblest aims and lives were only counters on her board. She was the one soul in her realm whom the news of St. Bartholomew stirred to no thirst for vengeance; and while England was thrilling with the triumph over the Armada, its queen was coolly grumbling over the cost, and making her profit out of the spoiled provisions she had ordered for

the fleet that saved her. No womanly sympathy bound her even to those who stood closest to her life. She loved Leicester, indeed; she was grateful to Cecil. But for the most part she was deaf to the voices either of love or gratitude. She accepted such services as were never rendered to any other English sovereign without a thought of return. Walsingham spent his fortune in saving her life and her throne, and she left him to die a beggar. But, as if by a strange irony, it was to this very lack of womanly sympathy that she owed some of the grandest features of her character. If she was without love she was without hate. She cherished no petty resentments; she never stooped to envy or suspicion of the men who served her. She was indifferent to abuse. Her good-humor was never ruffled by the charges of wantonness and cruelty with which the Jesuits filled every court in Europe. She was insensible to fear. Her life became at last a mark for assassin after assassin, but the thought of peril was the thought hardest to bring home to her. Even when Catholic plots broke out in her very household she would listen to no proposals for the removal of Catholics from her court.

718. If any trace of her sex lingered in the queen's actual statesmanship, it was seen in the simplicity and tenacity of purpose that often underlies a woman's fluctuations of feeling. It was the directness and steadiness of her aims which gave her her marked superiority over the statesmen of her time. No nobler group of ministers ever gathered round a council-board than those who gathered round the

council-board of Elizabeth. But she was the instrument of none. She listened, she weighed, she used or put by the counsels of each in turn, but her policy, as a whole was her own. It was a policy, not of genius, but of good sense. Her aims were simple and obvious: to preserve her throne, to keep England out of war, to restore civil and religious order. Something of womanly caution and timidity, perhaps, backed the passionless indifference with which she set aside the larger schemes of ambition which were ever opening before her eyes. In later days she was resolute in her refusal of the Low Countries. She rejected with a laugh the offers of the Protestants to make her "head of the religion" and "mistress of the seas." But her amazing success in the end sprang mainly from this wise limitation of her aims. She had a finer sense than any of her counselors of her real resources; she knew instinctively how far she could go and what she could do. Her cold, critical intellect was never swayed by enthusiasm or by panic either to exaggerate or to underestimate her risks or her power. Of political wisdom, indeed, in its larger and more generous sense, Elizabeth had little or none; but her political tact was unerring. She seldom saw her course at a glance, but she played with a hundred courses, fitfully and discursively, as a musician runs his finger over the keyboard, till she hit suddenly upon the right one. Her nature was essentially practical and of the present. She distrusted a plan, in fact, just in proportion to its speculative range or its outlook into the future. Her notion of statesmanship lay in watching how

things turned out around her, and in seizing the moment for making the best of them.

714. Such a policy as this, limited, practical, tentative, as it always was, had little of grandeur and originality about it; it was apt, indeed, to degenerate into mere trickery and finesse. But it was a policy suited to the England of her day, to its small resources and the transitional character of its religious and political belief, and it was eminently suited to Elizabeth's peculiar powers. It was a policy of detail, and in details her wonderful readiness and ingenuity found scope for their exercise. "No war, my lords," the queen used to cry imperiously at the council-board; "no war!" but her hatred of war sprang not so much from aversion to blood or to expense, real as was her aversion to both, as from the fact that peace left the field open to the diplomatic maneuvers and intrigues in which she excelled. Her delight in the consciousness of her ingenuity broke out in a thousand puckish freaks, freaks in which one can hardly see any purpose beyond the purpose of sheer mystification. She reveled in "by-ways" and "crooked ways." She played with grave cabinets as a cat plays with a mouse, and with much of the same feline delight in the mere embarrassment of her victims. When she was weary of mystifying foreign statesmen, she turned to find fresh sport in mystifying her own ministers. Had Elizabeth written the story of her reign she would have prided herself, not on the triumph of England or the ruin of Spain, but on the skill with which she had hoodwinked and outwitted every statesman in Europe

during fifty years. Nothing is more revolting but nothing is more characteristic of the queen than her shameless mendacity. It was an age of political lying, but in the profusion and recklessness of her lies Elizabeth stood without a peer in Christendom. A falsehood was to her simply an intellectual means of meeting a difficulty; and the ease with which she asserted or denied whatever suited her purpose was only equaled by the cynical indifference with which she met the exposure of her lies as soon as their purpose was answered. Her trickery, in fact, had its political value. Ignoble and wearisome as the queen's diplomacy seems to us now, tracking it as we do through a thousand dispatches, it succeeded in its main end, for it gained time, and every year that was gained doubled Elizabeth's strength. She made as dexterous a use of the foibles of her temper. Her levity carried her gayly over moments of detection and embarrassment where better women would have died of shame. She screened her tentative and hesitating statesmanship under the natural timidity and vacillation of her sex. She turned her very luxury and sports to good account. There were moments of grave danger in her reign when the country remained indifferent to its perils, as it saw the queen give her days to hawking and hunting and her nights to dancing and plays. Her vanity and affectation, her womanly fickleness and caprice, all had their part in the diplomatic comedies she played with the successive candidates for her hand. If political necessities made her life a lonely one, she had, at any rate, the satisfaction of averting war and conspira-

cies by love sonnets, and romantic interviews, or of gaining a year of tranquillity by the dexterous spinning out of a flirtation.

715. As we track Elizabeth through her tortuous mazes of lying and intrigue, the sense of her greatness is almost lost in a sense of contempt. But wrapped as they were in a cloud of mystery, the aims of her policy were throughout temperate and simple, and they were pursued with a rare tenacity. The sudden acts of energy which from time to time broke her habitual hesitation proved that it was no hesitation of weakness. Elizabeth could wait and *finesse*; but when the hour was come she could strike, and strike hard. Her natural temper, indeed, tended to a rash self-confidence rather than to self-distrust. "I have the heart of a king," she cried at a moment of utter peril, and it was with a kingly unconsciousness of the dangers about her that she fronted them for fifty years. She had, as strong natures always have, an unbounded confidence in her luck. "Her majesty counts much on fortune," Walsingham wrote bitterly; "I wish she would trust more in Almighty God." The diplomatists who censured at one moment her irresolution, her delay, her changes of front, censured at the next her "obstinacy," her iron will, her defiance of what seemed to them inevitable ruin. "This woman," Philip's envoy wrote, after a wasted remonstrance, "this woman is possessed by a hundred thousand devils." To her own subjects, who knew nothing of her maneuvers and flirtations, of her "by-ways" and "crooked ways," she seemed the embodiment of dauntless resolution.

Brave as they were, the men who swept the Spanish main or glided between the icebergs of Baffin's bay never doubted that the palm of bravery lay with their queen.

716. It was this dauntless courage which backed Elizabeth's good luck in the Scottish war. The issue of the war wholly changed her position at home and abroad. Not only had she liberated herself from the control of Philip, and successfully defied the threats of the Guises, but at a single blow she had freed England from what had been its sorest danger for 200 years. She had broken the dependence of Scotland upon France. That perpetual peace between England and the Scots which the policy of the Tudors steadily aimed at was at last sworn in the treaty of Edinburgh. If the queen had not bound to her all Scotland, she had bound to her the strongest and most vigorous party among the nobles of the north. The lords of the congregation promised to be obedient to Elizabeth in all such matters as might not lead to the overthrow of their country's rights or of Scottish liberties. They were bound to her not only by the war, but by the events that followed the war. A parliament at Edinburgh accepted the Calvinistic confession of Geneva as the religion of Scotland, abolished the temporal jurisdiction of the bishops, and prohibited the celebration of the mass. The act and the treaty were alike presented for confirmation to Francis and Mary. They were roughly put aside, for the French king would give no sanction to a successful revolt, and Mary had no mind to waive

her claim to the English throne. But from action the two sovereigns were held back by the troubles in France. It was in vain that the Guises strove to restore political and religious unity by an assembly of the French notables; the notables met only to receive a demand for freedom of worship from the Huguenots of the west, and to force the government to promise a national council for the settlement of the religious disputes as well as a gathering of the states-general. The counselors of Francis resolved to anticipate this meeting by a sudden stroke at the heretics; and as a preliminary step the chiefs of the house of Bourbon were seized at the court and the Prince of Condé threatened with death. The success of this measure roused anew the wrath of the young king at the demands of the Scots, and at the close of 1560 Francis was again nursing plans of vengeance on the lords of the congregation. But Elizabeth's good fortune still proved true to her. The projects of the Guises were suddenly foiled by the young king's death. The power of Mary Stuart and her kindred came to an end, for the childhood of Charles the Ninth gave the regency over France to the queen-mother, Catharine of Medicis, and the policy of Catharine secured England and Scotland alike from danger of attack. Her temper, like that of Elizabeth, was a purely political temper; her aim was to balance Catholics against Protestants to the profit of the throne. She needed peace abroad to preserve this political and religious balance at home, and though she made some fruitless efforts to renew the old friendship with Scotland,

she had no mind to intrigue, like the Guises, with the English Catholics, nor to back Mary Stuart's pretensions to the English throne.

717. With Scotland as an ally and with France at peace, Elizabeth's throne at last seemed secure. The outbreak of the strife between the old faith and the new, indeed, if it gave the queen safety abroad, somewhat weakened her at home. The sense of a religious change, which her caution had done so much to disguise, broke slowly on England as it saw the queen allying herself with Scotch Calvinists and French Huguenots; and the compromise she had hoped to establish in matters of worship became hourly less possible as the more earnest Catholics discerned the Protestant drift of Elizabeth's policy. But Philip still held them back from any open resistance. There was much, indeed, to move him from his old support of the queen. The widowhood of Mary Stuart freed him from his dread of a permanent annexation of Scotland by France, as well as of a French annexation of England, while the need of holding England as a check on French hostility to the house of Austria grew weaker as the outbreak of civil war between the Guises and their opponents rendered French hostility less possible. Elizabeth's support of the Huguenots drove the Spanish king to a burst of passion. A Protestant France not only outraged his religious bigotry, but, as he justly feared, it would give an impulse to heresy throughout his possessions in the Netherlands which would make it hard to keep his hold upon them. Philip noted that the success of the Scotch Calvinists had

been followed by the revolt of the Calvinists in France. He could hardly doubt that the success of the French Huguenots would be followed by a rising of the Calvinists in the Low Countries. "Religion," he told Elizabeth, angrily, "was being made a cloak for anarchy and revolution." But vexed as Philip was with her course, both abroad and at home, he was still far from withdrawing his support from Elizabeth. Even now he could not look upon the queen as lost to Catholicism. He knew how her course both at home and abroad had been forced on her, not by religious enthusiasm but by political necessity, and he still "trusted that ere long God would give us either a general council or a good pope who would correct abuses, and then all would go well. That God would allow so noble and Christian a realm as England to break away from Christendom and run the risk of perdition he could not believe."

718. What was needed, Philip thought, was a change of policy in the papacy. The bigotry of Paul the Fourth had driven England from the obedience of the Roman see. The gentler policy of Pius the Fourth might yet restore her to it. Pius was as averse from any break with Elizabeth as Philip was. He censured bitterly the harshness of his predecessor. The loss of Scotland and the threatened loss of France he laid to the charge of the wars which Paul had stirred up against Philip, and which had opened a way for the spread of Calvinism in both kingdoms. England, he held, could have been easily preserved for Catholicism but for Paul's rejection of the conciliatory efforts of Pole. When he ascended the papal

throne at the end of 1559, indeed, the accession of England to the reformation seemed complete. The royal supremacy was re-established; the mass abolished; the English liturgy restored. A new episcopate, drawn from the Calvinistic refugees, was being gathered round Matthew Parker. But Pius would not despair. He saw no reason why England should not again be Catholic. He knew that the bulk of its people clung to the older religion, if they clung also to independence of the papal jurisdiction and to the secularization of the abbey lands. The queen, as he believed, had been ready for a compromise at her accession, and he was ready to make terms with her now. In the spring of 1560, therefore, he dispatched Parpaglia, a follower of Pole, to open negotiations with Elizabeth. The moment which the pope had chosen was a critical one for the queen. She was in the midst of the Scotch war, and her forces had just been repulsed in an attempt to storm the walls of Leith. Such a repulse woke fears of conspiracy among the Catholic nobles of the northern border, and a refusal to receive the legate would have driven them to an open rising. On the other hand, the reception of Parpaglia would have alienated the Protestants, shaken the trust of the lords of the congregation in the queen's support, and driven them to make terms with Francis and Mary. In either case Scotland fell again under the rule of France, and the throne of Elizabeth was placed in greater peril than ever. So great was the queen's embarrassment that she availed herself of Cecil's absence in the north to hold out hopes of the legate's admission to the realm

and her own reconciliation with the papacy. But she was freed from these difficulties by the resolute intervention of Philip. If he disapproved of her policy in Scotland, he had no mind that Scotland should become wholly French or Elizabeth be really shaken on her throne. He ordered the legate, therefore, to be detained in Flanders till his threats had obtained from the pope an order for his recall.

719. But Pius was far from abandoning his hopes. After ten years' suspension he had again summoned the Council of Trent. The cry for church reform, the threat of national synods in Spain and in France, forced this measure on the pope; and Pius availed himself of the assembly of the council to make a fresh attempt to turn the tide of the reformation and to win back the Protestant churches to Catholicism. He called, therefore, on the Lutheran princes of Germany to send doctors to the council, and in May, 1561, eight months after Parpaglia's failure, dispatched a fresh nuncio, Martinengo, to invite Elizabeth to send ambassadors to Trent. Philip pressed for the nuncio's admission to the realm. His hopes of the queen's return to the faith were now being fed by a new marriage negotiation; for on the withdrawal of the Archduke of Austria in sheer weariness of Elizabeth's treachery, she had encouraged her old playfellow, Lord Robert Dudley, to hope for her hand and to amuse Philip by pledges of bringing back "the religion," should the help of the Spanish king enable him to win it. Philip gave his help, but Dudley remained a suitor, and the hopes of a Catholic revolution became fainter than ever. The

queen would suffer no landing of a legate in her realm. The invitation to the council fared no better. The Lutheran states of North Germany had already refused to attend. The council, they held, was no longer a council of reunion. In its earlier session it had formally condemned the very doctrine on which Protestantism was based; and to join it now would simply be to undo all that Luther had done. Elizabeth showed as little hesitation. The hour of her triumph, when a Calvinistic Scotland and a Calvinistic France proved the mainstays of her policy, was no hour of submission to the papacy. In spite of Philip's entreaties, she refused to send envoys to what was not "a free Christian council." The refusal was decisive in marking Elizabeth's position. The long period of hesitation, of drift, was over. All chance of submission to the papacy was at an end. In joining the Lutheran states in their rejection of this council, England had definitely ranged itself on the side of the reformation.

---

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### ENGLAND AND MARY STUART.

1561—1567.

720. WHAT had hitherto kept the bulk of Elizabeth's subjects from opposition to her religious system was a disbelief in its permanence. Englishmen had seen English religion changed too often to believe that it would change no more. When the commissioners forced a Protestant ritual on St.

John's college at Oxford, its founder, Sir Thomas White, simply took away its vestments and crucifixes, and hid them in his house for the better times that every zealous Catholic trusted would have their turn. They believed that a Catholic marriage would at once bring such a turn about; and if Elizabeth dismissed the offer of Philip's hand she played long and assiduously with that of a son of the emperor, an archduke of the same Austrian house. But the alliance with the Scotch heretics proved a rough blow to this trust: and after the repulse at Leith there were whispers that the two great Catholic nobles of the border, the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland, were only waiting for the failure of the Scotch enterprise to rise on behalf of the older faith. Whatever their projects were, they were crushed by the queen's success. With the lords of the congregation masters across the border the northern earls lay helpless between the two Protestant realms. In the mass of men loyalty was still too strong for any dream of revolt; but there was a growing uneasiness lest they should find themselves heretics after all, which the failure of the Austrian match and the help given to the Huguenots was fanning into active discontent. It was this which gave such weight to the queen's rejection of the summons to Trent. Whatever color she might strive to put upon it, the bulk of her subjects accepted the refusal as a final break with Catholicism, as a final close to all hope of their reunion with the Catholic church.

731. The Catholic disaffection which the queen

was henceforth to regard as her greatest danger was thus growing into life when in August, 1561, but a few months after the queen's refusal to acknowledge the council, Mary Stuart landed at Leith. Girl as she was, and she was only nineteen, Mary was hardly inferior in intellectual power to Elizabeth herself, while in fire and grace and brilliancy of temper she stood high above her. She brought with her the voluptuous refinement of the French renaissance; she would lounge for days in bed, and rise only at night for dances and music. But her frame was of iron, and incapable of fatigue; she galloped ninety miles after her last defeat without a pause, save to change horses. She loved risk and adventure and the ring of arms; as she rode in a foray to the north the swordsmen beside her heard her wish she was a man "to know what life it was to lie all night in the fields, or to walk on the cawsey with a jack and knapschalle, a Glasgow buckler and a broadsword." But in the closet she was as cool and astute a politician as Elizabeth herself; with plans as subtle, and of a far wider and bolder range than the queen's. "Whatever policy is in all the chief and best practiced heads of France," wrote an English envoy, "whatever craft, falsehood, and deceit is in all the subtle brains of Scotland, is either fresh in this woman's memory, or she can fetch it out with a wet finger." Her beauty, her exquisite grace of manner, her generosity of temper and warmth of affection, her frankness of speech, her sensibility, her gayety, her womanly tears, her manlike courage, the play and freedom of her nature, the flashes of poetry that

broke from her at every intense moment of her life, flung a spell over friend or foe which has only deepened with the lapse of years. Even to Knollys, the sternest Puritan of his day, she seemed in her later captivity to be "a notable woman." "She seemeth to regard no ceremonious honor besides the acknowledgment of her estate royal. She showeth a disposition to speak much, to be bold, to be pleasant, to be very familiar. She showeth a great desire to be avenged on her enemies. She showeth a readiness to expose herself to all perils in hope of victory. She desireth much to hear of hardiness and valiancy, commending by name all approved hardy men of her country though they be her enemies, and she concealeth no cowardice even in her friends."

722. Of the stern bigotry, the intensity of passion, which lay beneath the winning surface of Mary's womanhood, men as yet knew nothing. But they at once recognized her political ability. Till now she had proved in her own despite a powerful friend to the reformation. It was her claim of the English crown which had seated Elizabeth on the throne, had thrown her on the support of the Protestants, and had secured to the queen in the midst of her religious changes the protection of Philip of Spain. It was the dread of Mary's ambition which had forced Elizabeth to back the lords of the congregation, and the dread of her husband's ambition which had driven Scotland to throw aside its jealousy of England, and ally itself with the queen. But with the death of Francis Mary's position had wholly changed. She had no longer the means of carrying

out her husband's threats of crushing the lords of the congregation by force of arms. The forces of France were in the hands of Catharine of Medicis; and Catharine was parted from her both by her dread of the Guises and by a personal hate. Yet the attitude of the lords became every day more threatening. They were pressing Elizabeth to marry the Earl of Arran, a chief of the house of Hamilton and near heir to the throne, a marriage which pointed to the complete exclusion of Mary from her realm. Even when this project failed, they rejected with stern defiance the young queen's proposal of restoring the old religion as a condition of her return. If they invited her to Scotland, it was in the name of the parliament which had set up Calvinism as the law of the land. Bitter as such terms must have been, Mary had no choice but to submit to them. To accept the offer of the Catholic lords of northern Scotland with the Earl of Huntly at their head, who proposed to welcome her in arms as a champion of Catholicism, was to risk a desperate civil war, a war which would in any case defeat a project far dearer to her than her plans for winning Scotland, the project she was nursing of winning the English realm. In the first months of her widowhood therefore her whole attitude was reversed. She received the leader of the Protestant lords, her half-brother, Lord James Stuart, at her court. She showed her favor to him by creating him Earl of Murray. She adopted his policy of accepting the religious changes in Scotland, and of bringing Elizabeth by friendly pressure to acknowledge her right, not of reigning

in her stead, but of following her on the throne. But while thus in form adopting Murray's policy, Mary at heart was resolute to carry out her own policy too. If she must win the Scots by submitting to a Protestant system in Scotland, she would rally round her the English Catholics by remaining a Catholic herself. If she ceased to call herself Queen of England and only pressed for her acknowledgment as rightful successor to Elizabeth, she would not formally abandon her claim to reign as rightful queen in Elizabeth's stead. Above all, she would give her compliance with Murray's counsels no legal air. No pressure either from her brother or from Elizabeth could bring the young queen to give her royal confirmation to the parliamentary acts which established the new religion in Scotland, or her signature to the treaty of Edinburgh. In spite of her habitual caution the bold words which broke from Mary Stuart on Elizabeth's refusal of a safe-conduct betrayed her hopes. "I came to France in spite of her brother's opposition," she said, "and I will return in spite of her own. She has combined with rebel subjects of mine: but there are rebel subjects in England too who would gladly listen to a call from me. I am a queen as well as she, and not altogether friendless. And perhaps I have as great a soul too!"

723. She saw, indeed, the new strength which was given her by her husband's death. Her cause was no longer hampered, either in Scotland or in England, by a national jealousy of French interference. It was with a resolve to break the league between

Elizabeth and the Scotch Protestants, to unite her own realm around her, and thus to give a firm base for her intrigues among the English Catholics, that Mary Stuart landed at Leith. The effect of her presence was marvelous. Her personal fascination revived the national loyalty, and swept all Scotland to her feet. Knox, the greatest and sternest of the Calvinistic preachers, alone withstood her spell. The rough Scotch nobles owned that there was in Mary "some enchantment whereby men are bewitched." It was clear, indeed, from the first that loyal as Scotland might be, its loyalty would be of little service to the queen if she attacked the new religion. At her entry into Edinburgh the children of the pageant presented her with a Bible and "made some speech concerning the putting away of the mass, and thereafter sang a psalm." It was only with difficulty that Murray won for her the right of celebrating mass at her court. But for the religious difficulty Mary was prepared. While steadily abstaining from any legal confirmation of the new faith, and claiming for her French followers freedom of Catholic worship, she denounced any attempt to meddle with the form of religion she found existing in the realm. Such a toleration was little likely to satisfy the more fanatical among the ministers; but even Knox was content with her promise "to hear the preaching," and brought his brethren to a conclusion, as "she might be won," "to suffer her for a time." If the preachers, indeed, maintained that the queen's liberty of worship "should be their thralldom," the bulk of the nation was content with Mary's acceptance of

the religious state of the realm. Nor was it distasteful to the secular leaders of the reforming party. The Protestant lords preferred their imperfect work to the more complete reformation which Knox and his fellows called for. They had no mind to adopt the whole Calvinistic system. They had adopted the Genevan confession of faith; but they rejected a book of discipline which would have organized the church on the Huguenot model. All demands for restitution of the church property which they were pillaging they set aside as a "fond imagination." The new ministers remained poor and dependent, while noble after noble was hanging an abbot to seize his estates in forfeiture, or roasting a commendator to wring from him a grant of abbey lands in fee.

724. The attitude of the lords favored the queen's designs. She was in effect bartering her toleration of their religion in exchange for her reception in Scotland and for their support of her claim to be named Elizabeth's successor. With Mary's landing at Leith the position of the English queen had suddenly changed. Her work seemed utterly undone. The national unity for which she was struggling was broken. The presence of Mary woke the party of the old faith to fresh hopes and a fresh activity, while it roused a fresh fear and fanaticism in the party of the new. Scotland, where Elizabeth's influence had seemed supreme, was struck from her hands. Not only was it no longer a support; it was again a danger. Loyalty, national pride, a just and statesmanlike longing for union with England, united

her northern subjects round the Scottish queen in her claim to be recognized as Elizabeth's successor. Even Murray counted on Elizabeth's consent to this claim to bring Mary into full harmony with his policy, and to preserve the alliance between England and Scotland. But the question of the succession, like the question of her marriage, was with Elizabeth a question of life and death. Her wedding with a Catholic or a Protestant suitor would have been equally the end of her system of balance and national union, a signal for the revolt of the party which she disappointed and for the triumphant dictation of the party which she satisfied. "If a Catholic prince come here," wrote a Spanish ambassador while pressing her marriage with an Austrian archduke, "the first mass he attends will be the signal for revolt." It was so with the question of the succession. To name a Protestant successor from the house of Suffolk would have driven every Catholic to insurrection. To name Mary was to stir Protestantism to a rising of despair, and to leave Elizabeth at the mercy of every fanatical assassin who wished to clear the way for a Catholic ruler. Yet to leave both unrecognized was to secure the hostility of both, as well as the discontent of the people at large, who looked on the settlement of the succession as the primary need of their national life. From the moment of Mary's landing, therefore, Elizabeth found herself thrown again on an attitude of self-defense. Every course of direct action was closed to her. She could satisfy neither Protestant nor Catholic, neither Scotland nor England. Her work could only be a work of patience,

the one possible policy was to wait, to meet dangers as they rose, to watch for possible errors in her rival's course; above all, by diplomacy, by finesse, by equivocation, by delay, to gain time till the dark sky cleared.

725. Nothing better proves Elizabeth's political ability than the patience, the tenacity, with which for the six years that followed she played this waiting game. She played it utterly alone. Even Cecil at moments of peril called for a policy of action. But his counsels never moved the queen. Her restless ingenuity vibrated ceaselessly, like the needle of a compass, from one point to another, now stirring hopes in Catholic, now in Protestant, now quivering toward Mary's friendship, then as suddenly trembling off to incur her hate. But tremble and vibrate as it might Elizabeth's purpose returned ever to the same unchanging point. It was in vain that Mary made a show of friendship, and negotiated for a meeting at York, where the question of the succession might be settled. It was in vain that to prove her lack of Catholic fanaticism she even backed Murray in crushing the Earl of Huntly, the foremost of her Catholic nobles, or that she held out hopes to the English envoy of her conformity to the faith of the church of England. It was to no purpose that, to meet the queen's dread of her marriage with a Catholic prince when her succession was once acknowledged, a marriage which would in such a case have shaken Elizabeth on her throne, Mary listened even to a proposal for a match with Lord Leicester, and that Murray supported such a step, if Elizabeth

would recognize Mary as her heir. Elizabeth promised that she would do nothing to impair Mary's rights; but she would do nothing to own them. "I am not so foolish," she replied, with bitter irony, to Mary's entreaties, "I am not so foolish as to hang a winding-sheet before my eyes." That such a refusal was wise time was to show. But even then it is probable that Mary's intrigues were not wholly hidden from the English queen. Elizabeth's lying paled indeed before the cool duplicity of this girl of nineteen. While she was befriending Protestantism in her realm, and holding out hopes of her mounting the English throne as a Protestant queen, Mary Stuart was pledging herself to the pope to restore Catholicism on either side the border, and pressing Philip to aid her in this holy work by giving her the hand of his son Don Carlos. It was with this design that she was fooling the Scotch lords and deceiving Murray; it was with this end that she strove in vain to fool Elizabeth and Knox.

726. But pierce through the web of lying as she might, the pressure on the English queen became greater every day. What had given Elizabeth security was the adhesion of the Scotch Protestants and the growing strength of the Huguenots in France. But the firm government of Murray and her own steady abstinence from any meddling with the national religion was giving Mary a hold upon Scotland which drew Protestant after Protestant to her side; while the tide of French Calvinism was suddenly rolled back by the rise of a Catholic party under the leadership of the Guises. Under Catharine

of Medicis, France had seemed to be slowly drifting to the side of Protestantism. While the queen-mother strove to preserve a religious truce the attitude of the Huguenots was that of men sure of success. Their head, the King of Navarre, boasted that before the year was out he would have the gospel preached throughout the realm, and his confidence seemed justified by the rapid advance of the new opinions. They were popular among the merchant class. The noblesse was fast becoming Huguenot. At the court itself the nobles feasted ostentatiously on the fast-days of the church and flocked to the Protestant preachings. The clergy themselves seemed shaken. Bishops openly abjured the older faith. Coligny's brother, the Cardinal of Chatillon, celebrated the communion instead of mass in his own episcopal church at Beauvais, and married a wife. So irresistible was the movement that Catharine saw no way of preserving France to Catholicism but by the largest concessions; and in the summer of 1561 she called on the pope to allow the removal of images, the administration of the sacrament in both kinds, and the abolition of private masses. Her demands were outstripped by those of an assembly of deputies from the states which met at Pontoise. These called for the confiscation of church property, for freedom of conscience and of worship, and, above all, for a national council in which every question should be decided by "the word of God." France seemed on the verge of becoming Protestant; and at a moment when Protestantism had won England and Scotland, and appeared to be fast winning southern

/

as well as northern Germany, the accession of France would have determined the triumph of the reformation. The importance of its attitude was seen in its effect on the papacy. It was the call of France for a national council that drove Rome once more to summon the Council of Trent. It was seen, too, in the policy of Mary Stuart. With France tending to Calvinism it was no time for meddling with the Calvinism of Scotland; and Mary rivaled Catharine herself in her pledges of toleration. It was seen, above all, in the anxiety of Philip of Spain. To preserve the Netherlands was still the main aim of Philip's policy, and with France as well as England Protestant, a revolt of the Netherlands against the cruelties of the Inquisition became inevitable. By appeals, therefore, to religious passion, by direct pledges of aid, the Spanish king strove to rally the party of the Guises against the system of Catharine.

727. But Philip's intrigues were hardly needed to rouse the French Catholics to arms. If the Guises had withdrawn from court it was only to organize resistance to the Huguenots. They were aided by the violence of their opponents. The Huguenot lords believed themselves irresistible; they boasted that the churches numbered more than 300,000 men fit to bear arms. But the mass of the nation was hardly touched by the new gospel; and the Guises stirred busily the fanaticism of the poor. The failure of a conference between the advocates of either faith was the signal for a civil war in the south. Catharine strove in vain to allay the strife at the opening of 1562 by an edict of pacification; Guise struck his

counter-blow by massacring a Protestant congregation at Vassy, by entering Paris with 2,000 men, and by seizing the regent and the king. Condé and Coligny at once took up arms; and the fanaticism of the Huguenots broke out in a terrible work of destruction which rivaled that of the Scots. All western France, half southern France, the provinces along the Loire and the Rhone, rose for the gospel. Only Paris and the north of France held firmly to Catholicism. But the plans of the Guises had been ably laid. The Huguenots found themselves girt in by a ring of foes. Philip sent a body of Spaniards into Gascony, Italians and Piedmontese in the pay of the pope and the Duke of Savoy marched upon the Rhone. Seven thousand German mercenaries appeared in the camp of the Guises. Panic ran through the Huguenot forces; they broke up as rapidly as they had gathered; and resistance was soon only to be found in Normandy and in the mountains of the Cevennes.

Condé appealed for aid to the German princes and to England; and grudge as she might the danger and cost of such a struggle, Elizabeth saw that her aid must be given: She knew that the battle with her opponent had to be fought abroad rather than at home. The Guises were Mary's uncles; and their triumph meant trouble in Scotland and worse trouble in England. In September, therefore, she concluded a treaty with the Huguenots at Hampton Court, and promised to supply them with 6,000 men and 100,000 crowns. The bargain she drove was a hard one. She knew that the French had no purpose of

•

fulfilling their pledge to restore Calais, and she exacted the surrender of Havre into her hands as a security for its restoration. Her aid came almost too late. The Guises saw the need of securing Normandy if English intervention was to be hindered, and a vigorous attack brought about the submission of the province. But the Huguenots were now re-enforced by troops from the German princes; and at the close of 1562 the two armies met on the field of Dreux. The strife had already widened into a general war of religion. It was the fight, not of French factions, but of Protestantism and Catholicism, that was to be fought out on the fields of France. The two warring elements of Protestantism were represented in the Huguenot camp, where German Lutherans stood side by side with the French Calvinists. On the other hand the French Catholics were backed by soldiers from the Catholic cantons of Switzerland, from the Catholic states of Germany, from Catholic Italy, and from Catholic Spain. The encounter was a desperate one, but it ended in a virtual triumph for the Guises. While the German troops of Coligny clung to the Norman coast in the hope of subsidies from Elizabeth, the Duke of Guise was able to march at the opening of 1563 on the Loire, and form the siege of Orleans.

729. In Scotland Mary Stuart was watching her uncle's progress with ever-growing hope. The policy of Murray had failed in the end to which she mainly looked. Her acceptance of the new religion, her submission to the lords of the congregation, had secured her a welcome in Scotland and gathered

•

the Scotch people round her standard. But it had done nothing for her on the other side of the border. Two years had gone by, and any recognition of her right of succession to the English crown seemed as far off as ever. But Murray's policy was far from being Mary's only resource. She had never surrendered herself in more than outer show to her brother's schemes. In heart she had never ceased to be a bigoted Catholic, resolute for the suppression of Protestantism as soon as her toleration of it had given her strength enough for the work. It was this that made the strife between the two queens of such terrible moment for English freedom. Elizabeth was fighting for more than personal ends. She was fighting for more than her own occupation of the English throne. Consciously or unconsciously she was struggling to avert from England the rule of a queen who would have undone the whole religious work of the past half century, who would have swept England back into the tide of Catholicism, and who in doing this would have blighted and crippled its national energies at the very moment of their mightiest development. It was the presence of such a danger that sharpened the eyes of Protestants on both sides the border. However she might tolerate the reformed religion or hold out hopes of her compliance with a reformed worship, no earnest Protestant either in England or in Scotland could bring himself to see other than an enemy in the Scottish queen. Within a few months of her arrival the cool eye of Knox had pierced through the veil of Mary's dissimulation. "The queen," he wrote

to Cecil, "neither is nor shall be of our opinion." Her steady refusal to ratify the treaty of Edinburgh or to confirm the statutes on which the Protestantism of Scotland rested was of far greater significance than her support of Murray or her honeyed messages to Elizabeth. While the young queen looked coolly on at the ruin of the Catholic house of Huntly, at the persecution of Catholic recusants, at so strict an enforcement of the new worship that "none within the realm durst more avow the hearing or saying of mass than the thieves of Liddesdale durst avow their stealth in presence of an upright judge," she was in secret correspondence with the Guises and the pope. Her eye was fixed upon France. While Catharine of Medicis was all-powerful, while her edict secured toleration for the Huguenot on one side of the sea, Mary knew that it was impossible to refuse toleration on the other. But with the first movement of the Duke of Guise fiercer hopes revived. Knox was "assured that the queen danced till after midnight because that she had received letters that persecution was begun in France, and that her uncles were beginning to stir their tail, and to trouble the whole realm of France." Whether she gave such open proof of her joy or no, Mary woke to a new energy at the news of Guise's success. She wrote to Pope Pius to express her regret that the heresy of her realm prevented her sending envoys to the Council of Trent. She assured the Cardinal of Lorraine that she would restore Catholicism in her dominions, even at the peril of her life. She pressed on Philip of Spain a proposal

for her marriage with his son Don Carlos as a match which would make her strong enough to restore Scotland to the church.

730. The echo of the French conflict was felt in England as in the north. The English Protestants saw in it the approach of a struggle for life and death at home. The English queen saw in it a danger to her throne. So great was Elizabeth's terror at the victory of Droux that she resolved to open her purse-strings and to hire fresh troops for the Huguenots in Germany. But her dangers grew at home as abroad. The victory of Guise dealt the first heavy blow at her system of religious conformity. Rome had abandoned its dreams of conciliation on her refusal to own the Council of Trent, and though Philip's entreaties brought Pius to suspend the issue of a bull of deposition, the papacy opened the struggle by issuing, in August, 1562, a brief which pronounced joining in the common prayer schismatic and forbade the attendance of Catholics at church. On no point was Elizabeth so sensitive, for on no point had her policy seemed so successful. Till now, whatever might be their fidelity to the older faith, few Englishmen had carried their opposition to the queen's changes so far as to withdraw from religious communion with those who submitted to them. But with the issue of the brief this unbroken conformity came to an end. A few of the hotter Catholics withdrew from church. Heavy fines were laid on them as recusants; fines which, as their numbers increased, became a valuable source of supply for the royal exchequer. But no fines could compen-

sate for the moral blow which their withdrawal dealt. It was the beginning of a struggle which Elizabeth had averted through three memorable years. Protestant fanaticism met Catholic fanaticism, and as news of the massacre at Vassy spread through England the Protestant preachers called for the death of "papists." The tidings of Dreux spread panic through the realm. The parliament, which met again in January, 1563, showed its terror by measures of a new severity. There had been enough of words, cried one of the queen's ministers, Sir Francis Knollys, "it was time to draw the sword."

731. The sword was drawn in the first of a series of penal statutes which weighed upon English Catholics for two hundred years. By this statute an oath of allegiance to the queen and of abjuration of the temporal authority of the pope was exacted from all holders of office, lay or spiritual, within the realm, with the exception of peers. Its effect was to place the whole power of the realm in the hands either of Protestants or of Catholics who accepted Elizabeth's legitimacy and her ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the teeth of the papacy. The oath of supremacy was already exacted from every clergyman and every member of the universities. But the obligation of taking it was now widely extended. Every member of the house of commons, every officer in the army or the fleet, every schoolmaster and private tutor, every justice of the peace, every municipal magistrate to whom the oath was tendered, was pledged from this moment to resist the blows

which Rome was threatening to deal. Extreme caution, indeed, was used in applying this test to the laity, but pressure was more roughly put on the clergy. A great part of the parish priests, though they had submitted to the use of the prayer-book, had absented themselves when called on to take the oath prescribed by the act of uniformity, and were known to be Catholics in heart. As yet Elizabeth had cautiously refused to allow any strict inquiry into their opinions. But a commission was now opened by her order at Lambeth to enforce the act of uniformity in public worship; while thirty-nine of the articles of faith drawn up under Edward the Sixth, which had till now been left in suspense by her government, were adopted in convocation as a standard of faith, and acceptance of them demanded from all the clergy.

732. With the test act and the establishment of the high commission the system which the queen had till now pursued in great measure ceased. Elizabeth had "drawn the sword." It is possible she might still have clung to her older policy had she foreseen how suddenly the danger which appalled her was to pass away. At this crisis, as ever, she was able to "count on fortune." The test act was hardly passed when, in February, 1563, the Duke of Guise was assassinated by a Protestant zealot, and with his murder the whole face of affairs was changed. The Catholic army was paralyzed by its leader's loss, while Coligny, who was now strengthened with money and forces from England, became master of Normandy. The war, however,

came quietly to an end; for Catharine of Medicis regained her power on the duke's death, and her aim was still an aim of peace. A treaty with the Huguenots was concluded in March, and a new edict of Amboise restored the truce of religion. Elizabeth's luck, indeed, was checkered by a merited humiliation. Now that peace was restored, Huguenot and Catholic united to demand the surrender of Tours; and an outbreak of plague among its garrison compelled the town to capitulate. The new strife in which England thus found itself involved with the whole realm of France moved fresh hopes in Mary Stuart. Mary had anxiously watched her uncle's progress, for his success would have given her the aid of a Catholic France in her projects on either side of the border. But even his defeat failed utterly to dishearten her. The war between the two queens which followed it might well force Catharine of Medicis to seek Scottish aid against England, and the Scottish queen would thus have secured that alliance with a great power which the English Catholics demanded before they would rise at her call. At home, troubles were gathering fast around her. Veil her hopes as she might, the anxiety with which she had followed the struggle of her kindred had not been lost on the Protestant leaders, and it is probable that Knox at any rate had learned something of her secret correspondence with the pope and the Guises. The Scotch Calvinists were stirred by the peril of their brethren in France, and the zeal of the preachers was roused by a revival of the old worship in Clydesdale and by the neglect

of the government to suppress it. In the opening of 1563 they resolved "to put to their own hands," and without further plaint to queen or council to carry out "the punishment that Gōd had appointed to idolaters in his law." In Mary's eyes such a resolve was rebellion. But her remonstrances only drew a more formal doctrine of resistance from Knox. "The sword of justice, madam, is God's," said the stern preacher, "and is given to princes and rulers for an end; which if they transgress, they that in the fear of God execute judgments when God has commanded offend not God. Neither yet sin they that bridle kings who strike innocent men in their rage." The queen was forced to look on while nearly fifty Catholics, some of them high ecclesiastics, were indicted and sent to prison for celebrating mass in Paisley and Ayrshire.

733. The zeal of the preachers was only heightened by the coolness of the lords. A Scotch parliament which assembled in the summer of 1563 contented itself with securing the spoilers in their possession of the church lands, but left the acts passed in 1560 for the establishment of Protestantism unconfirmed as before. Such a silence Knox regarded as treason to the faith. He ceased to have any further intercourse with Murray, and addressed a burning appeal to the lords: "Will ye betray God's cause when ye have it in your hands to establish it as ye please? The queen, ye say, will not agree with you. Ask ye of her that which by God's word ye may justly require, and if she will not agree with ye in God, ye are not bound to agree with her in the

devil!" The inaction of the nobles proved the strength which Mary drew from the attitude of France. So long as France and England were at war, so long as a French force might at any moment be dispatched to Mary's aid, it was impossible for them to put pressure on the queen; and bold as was the action of the preachers, the queen only waited her opportunity for dealing them a fatal blow. But whatever hopes Mary may have founded on the strife, they were soon brought to an end. Catharine used her triumph only to carry out her system of balance, and to resist the joint remonstrance of the pope, the emperor, and the King of Spain against her edict of toleration. The policy of Elizabeth, on the other hand, was too much identified with Catharine's success to leave room for further hostilities; and a treaty of peace between the two countries was concluded in the spring of 1564.

734. The peace with France marked a crisis in the struggle between the rival queens. It left Elizabeth secure against a Catholic rising and free to meet the pressure from the north. But it dashed the last hopes of Mary Stuart to the ground. The policy which she had pursued from her landing in Scotland had proved a failure in the end at which it aimed. Her religious toleration, her patience, her fair speeches, had failed to win from Elizabeth a promise of the succession. And meanwhile the Calvinism she hated was growing bolder and bolder about her. The strife of religion in France had woke a fiercer bigotry in the Scotch preachers. Knox had discovered her plans of reaction, had publicly denounced

her designs of a Catholic marriage, and had met her angry tears, her threats of vengeance, with a cool defiance. All that Murray's policy seemed to have really done was to estrange from her the English Catholics. Already alienated from Mary by her connection with France, which they still regarded as a half-heretic power, and by the hostility of Philip, in whom they trusted as a pure Catholic, the adherents of the older faith could hardly believe in the queen's fidelity to their religion when they saw her abandoning Scotland to heresy and holding out hopes of her acceptance of the Anglican creed. Her presence had roused them to a new energy, and they were drifting more and more as the strife waxed warmer abroad to dreams of forcing on Elizabeth a Catholic successor. But as yet their hopes turned not so much to Mary Stuart as to the youth who stood next to the Scottish queen in the line of blood. Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley, was a son of the Countess of Lennox, Margaret Douglas, a daughter of Margaret Tudor by her second marriage with the Earl of Angus. Lady Lennox was the successor whom Mary Tudor would willingly have chosen in her sister's stead, had Philip and the parliament suffered her; and from the moment of Elizabeth's accession the countess had schemed to drive her from the throne. She offered Philip to fly with her boy to the Low Countries and to serve as a pretender in his hands. She intrigued with the partisans of the old religion. Though the house of Lennox conformed to the new system of English worship, its sympathies were known to be Catholic, and the hopes of the Catholics

wrapped themselves round its heir. "Should any disaster befall the queen," wrote a Spanish ambassador in 1560, "the Catholics would choose Lord Darnley for king." "Not only," he adds in a later letter, "would all sides agree to choose him were the queen to die, but the Catholic lords, if opportunity offer, may declare for him at once."

735. His strongest rival was Mary Stuart, and before Mary landed in Scotland, Lady Lennox planned the union of both their claims by the marriage of her son with the Scottish queen. A few days after her landing Mary received a formal offer of his hand. Hopes of yet greater matches, of a marriage with Philip's son Don Carlos, or with the young French king, Charles the Ninth, had long held the scheme at bay ; but as these and her policy of conciliation proved alike fruitless, Mary turned to the Lennoxes. The marriage was probably planned by David Rizzio, a young Piedmontese who had won the Scotch queen's favor, and through whom she conducted the intrigues, both in England and abroad, by which she purposed to free herself from Murray's power and to threaten Elizabeth. Her diplomacy was winning Philip to her cause. The Spanish king had as yet looked upon Mary's system of toleration and on her hopes from France with equal suspicion. But he now drew slowly to her side. Pressed hard in the Mediterranean by the Turks, he was harassed more than ever by the growing discontent of the Netherlands, where the triumph of Protestantism in England and Scotland and the power of the Huguenots in France gave fresh vigor

to the growth of Calvinism, and where the nobles were stirred to new outbreaks against the foreign rule of Spain by the success of the Scottish lords in their rising and by the terms of semi-independence which the French nobles wrested from the queen. It was to hold the Netherlands in check that Philip longed for Mary's success. Her triumph over Murray and his confederates would vindicate the cause of monarchy; her triumph over Calvinism would vindicate that of Catholicism both in her own realm and in the realm which she hoped to win. He sent her, therefore, assurances of his support, and assurances as strong reached her from the Vatican. The dispensation which was secretly obtained for her marriage with Darnley was granted on the pledge of both to do their utmost for the restoration of the old religion.

736. Secret as was the pledge, the mere whisper of the match revealed their danger to the Scotch Protestants. The lords of the congregation woke with a start from their confidence in the queen. Murray saw that the policy to which he had held his sister since her arrival in the realm was now to be abandoned. Mary was no longer to be the Catholic ruler of a Protestant country, seeking peaceful acknowledgment of her right of succession to Elizabeth's throne; she had placed herself at the head of the English Catholics, and such a position at once threatened the safety of Protestantism in Scotland itself. If once Elizabeth were overthrown by a Catholic rising, and a Catholic policy established in England, Scotch Protestantism was at an

end. At the first rumor of the match, therefore, Murray drew Argyle and the Hamiltons round him in a band of self-defense, and refused his signature to a paper recommending Darnley as husband to the queen. But Mary's diplomacy detached from him lord after lord, till his only hope lay in the opposition of Elizabeth. The marriage with Darnley was undoubtedly a danger even more formidable to England than to Scotland. It put an end to the dissensions which had till now broken the strength of the English Catholics. It rallied them round Mary and Darnley as successors to the throne. It gathered to their cause the far greater mass of cautious conservatives who had been detached from Mary by her foreign blood and by dread of her kinship with the Guises. Darnley was reckoned an Englishman, and with an English husband to sway her policy Mary herself seemed to become an Englishwoman. But it was in vain that the council pronounced the marriage a danger to the realm, that Elizabeth threatened Mary with war, or that she plotted with Murray for the seizure of Mary and the driving of Darnley back over the border. Threat and plot were too late to avert the union, and at the close of July, 1565, Darnley was married to Mary Stuart and proclaimed King of Scotland. Murray at once called the lords of the congregation to arms. But the most powerful and active stood aloof. As heir of the line of Angus, Darnley was by blood the head of the house of Douglas, and, Protestants as they were, the Douglasses rallied to their kinsman. Their actual

chieftain, the Earl of Morton, stood next to Murray himself in his power over the congregation; he was chancellor of the realm; and his strength as a great noble was backed by a dark and unscrupulous ability. By waiving their claim to the earldom of Angus and the lands which he held, the Lennoxes won Morton to his kinsman's cause, and the earl was followed in his course by two of the sternest and most active among the Protestant lords, Darnley's uncle, Lord Ruthven, and Lord Lindsay, who had married a Douglas. Their desertion broke Murray's strength; and his rising was hardly declared when Mary marched on his little force with pistols in her belt and drove its leaders over the border.

737. The work which Elizabeth had done in Scotland had been undone in an hour. Murray was a fugitive. The lords of the congregation were broken or dispersed. The English party was ruined. And while Scotland was lost it seemed as if the triumph of Mary was a signal for the general revival of Catholicism. The influence of the Guises had again become strong in France, and though Catharine of Medicis held firmly to her policy of toleration, an interview which she held with Alva at Bayonne led every Protestant to believe in the conclusion of a league between France and Spain for a common war on Protestantism. To this league the English statesmen held that Mary Stuart had become a party, and her pressure upon Elizabeth was backed by the suspicion that the two great monarchies had pledged her their support. No such league existed,

nor had such a pledge been given, but the dread served Mary's purpose as well as the reality could have done. Girt in, as she believed, with foes, Elizabeth took refuge in the meanest dissimulation, while Mary Stuart imperiously demanded a recognition of her succession as the price of peace. But her aims went far beyond this demand. She found herself greeted at Rome as the champion of the faith. Pius the Fifth, who mounted the papal throne at the moment of her success, seized on the young queen to strike the first blow in the crusade against Protestantism on which he was set. He promised her troops and money. He would support her, he said, so long as he had a single chalice to sell. "With the help of God and your holiness," Mary wrote back, "I will leap over the wall." In England itself the marriage and her new attitude rallied every Catholic to Mary's standard; and the announcement of her pregnancy which followed gave her a strength that swept aside Philip's counsels of caution and delay. The daring advice of Rizzio fell in with her natural temper. She resolved to restore Catholicism in Scotland. Yield as she might to Murray's pressure, she had dexterously refrained from giving legal confirmation to the resolutions of the parliament by which Calvinism had been set up in Scotland; and in the parliament which she summoned for the coming spring she trusted to do "some good anent restoring the old religion." The appearance of the Catholic lords, the Earls of Huntly, Athol, and Bothwell, at Mary's court showed her purpose to attempt this religious revolution. Nor were her

political schemes less resolute. She was determined to wring from the coming parliament a confirmation of the banishment of the lords who had fled with Murray, which would free her forever from the pressure of the Protestant nobles. Mistress of her kingdom, politically as well as religiously, Mary could put a pressure on Elizabeth which might win for her more than an acknowledgment of her right to the succession. She still clung to her hopes of the crown; and she knew that the Catholics of Northumberland and Yorkshire were ready to revolt as soon as she was ready to aid them.

738. No such danger had ever threatened Elizabeth as this. But again she could "trust to fortune." Mary had staked all on her union with Darnley, and yet only a few months had passed since her wedding-day, when men saw that she "hated the king." The boy turned out a dissolute, insolent husband; and Mary's scornful refusal of his claim of the "crown matrimonial," which would have given him an equal share of the royal power with herself, widened the breach between them. Darnley attributed this refusal to Rizzio's counsels; and his father, Lord Lennox, joined with him in plotting vengeance against the minister. They sought aid from the very party whom Darnley's marriage had been planned to crush. Though the strength of the Protestant nobles had been broken by the flight of Murray, the Douglasses remained at the court. Morton had no purpose of lending himself to the ruin of the religion he professed, and Ruthven and Lindsay were roused to action when

they saw themselves threatened with a restoration of Catholicism, and with a legal banishment of Murray and his companions in the coming parliament, which could only serve as a prelude to their own ruin. Rizzio was the author of this policy; and when Darnley called on his kinsmen to aid him in attacking Rizzio, the Douglasses grasped at his proposal. Their aid and their promise of the crown matrimonial was bought by Darnley's consent to the recall of the fugitive lords and of Murray. The plot of the Douglasses was so jealously hidden that no whisper of it reached the queen. Her plans were on the brink of success. The Catholic nobles were ready for action at her court. Huntly and Bothwell were called into the privy council. At the opening of March, 1566, the parliament which was to carry out her projects was to assemble; and the queen prepared for her decisive stroke by naming men whom she could trust as lords of the articles—a body with whom lay the proposal of measures to the houses—and by restoring the bishops to their old places among the peers. But at the moment when Mary revealed the extent of her schemes by her dismissal of the English ambassador, the young king, followed by Lord Ruthven, burst into her chamber, dragged Rizzio from her presence, and stabbed him in an outer chamber, while Morton and Lord Lindsay with their followers seized the palace gate. Mary found herself a prisoner in the hands of her husband and his confederates. Her plans were wrecked in an hour. A proclamation of the king dissolved the parliament which she had called for the ruin of her foes; and

Murray, who was on his way back from England when the deed was done, was received at court and restored to his old post at the council-board.

739. Terrible as the blow had been, it roused the more terrible energies which lay hid beneath the graceful bearing of the queen. The darker features of her character were now to develop themselves. With an inflexible will she turned to build up again the policy which seemed shattered in Rizzio's murder. Her passionate resentment bent to the demands of her ambition. "No more tears," she said when they brought her news of Rizzio's murder; "I will think upon revenge." But even revenge was not suffered to interfere with her political schemes. Keen as was Mary's thirst for vengeance on him, Darnley was needful to the triumph of her aims, and her first effort was to win him back. He was already grudging at the supremacy of the nobles and his virtual exclusion from power, when Mary, masking her hatred beneath a show of affection, succeeded in severing the wretched boy from his fellow-conspirators, and in gaining his help in an escape to Dunbar. Once free, a force of 8,000 men under the Earl of Bothwell quickly gathered round her, and with these troops she marched in triumph to Edinburgh. An offer of pardon to all save those concerned in Rizzio's murder broke up the force of the lords; Glencairn and Argyle joined the queen, while Morton, Ruthven, and Lindsay fled in terror over the border. But Mary had learned by a terrible lesson the need of dissimulation. She made no show of renewing her Catholic policy. On the contrary, she af-

fectured to resume the system which she had pursued from the opening of her reign, and suffered Murray to remain at the court. Rizzio's death had, in fact, strengthened her position. With him passed away the dread of a Catholic reaction. Mary's toleration, her pledges of extending an equal indulgence to Protestantism in England, should she mount its throne, her marriage to one who was looked upon as an English noble, above all, the hope of realizing through her succession the dream of a union of the realms, again told on the wavering body of more conservative statesmen, like Norfolk, and even drew to her side some of the steadier Protestants who despaired of a Protestant succession. Even Elizabeth at last seemed wavering toward a recognition of her as her successor. But Mary aimed at more than the succession. Her intrigues with the English Catholics were never interrupted. Her seeming reconciliation with the young king preserved that union of the whole Catholic body which her marriage had brought about and which the strife over Rizzio threatened with ruin. Her court was full of refugees from the northern counties. "Your actions," Elizabeth wrote in a sudden break of fierce candor, "are as full of venom as your words are of honey." Fierce words, however, did nothing to break the clouds that gathered thicker and thicker round England; and in June, the birth of a boy, the future James the Sixth of Scotland and First of England, doubled Mary's strength. Elizabeth felt bitterly the blow. "The Queen of Scots," she cried, "has a fair son, and I am but a barren stock." The birth

## ENGLAND AND MARY STUART. 207

of James, in fact, seemed to settle the long struggle in Mary's favor. The moderate conservatives joined the ranks of her adherents. The Catholics were wild with hope. "Your friends are so increased," her ambassador, Melville, wrote to her from England, "that many whole shires are ready to rebel, and their captains named by election of the nobility." On the other hand, the Protestants were filled with despair. It seemed as if no effort could avert the rule of England by a Catholic queen.

740. It was at this moment of peril that the English parliament was again called together. Its action showed more than the natural anxiety of the time; it showed the growth of those national forces which, far more than the schemes of Mary or the counter-schemes of Elizabeth, were to determine the future of England. While the two queens were heaping intrigue on intrigue, while abroad and at home every statesman held firmly that national welfare or national misery hung on the fortune of the one or the success of the other, the English people itself was steadily moving forward to a new spiritual enlightenment and a new political liberty. The intellectual and religious impulses of the age were already combining with the influence of its growing wealth to revive a spirit of independence in the nation at large. It was impossible for Elizabeth to understand this spirit, but her wonderful tact enabled her from the first to feel the strength of it. Long before any open conflict arose between the people and the crown we see her instinctive perception of the changes which were going on around her in the modifications, conscious

or unconscious, which she introduced into the system of the monarchy. Of its usurpations upon English liberty she abandoned none. But she curtailed and softened down almost all. She tampered, as her predecessors had tampered, with personal freedom; there was the same straining of statutes and coercion of juries in political trials as before, and an arbitrary power of imprisonment was still exercised by the council. The duties she imposed on cloth and sweet wines were an assertion of her right of arbitrary taxation. Proclamations in council constantly assumed the force of law. But, boldly as it was asserted, the royal power was practically wielded with a caution and moderation that showed the sense of a growing difficulty in the full exercise of it. The ordinary course of justice was left undisturbed. The jurisdiction of the council was asserted almost exclusively over the Catholics, and defended in their case as a precaution against pressing dangers. The proclamations issued were temporary in character and of small importance. The two duties imposed were so slight as to pass almost unnoticed in the general satisfaction at Elizabeth's abstinence from internal taxation. She abandoned the benevolences and forced loans which had brought home the sense of tyranny to the subjects of her predecessors. She treated the privy seals, which on emergencies she issued for advances to her exchequer, simply as anticipations of her revenue (like our own exchequer bills), and punctually repaid them. The monopolies with which she fettered trade proved a more serious grievance; but during her earlier reign they were

looked on as a part of the system of merchant associations, which were at that time regarded as necessary for the regulation and protection of the growing commerce.

741. The political development of the nation is seen still more in the advance of the parliament during Elizabeth's reign. The queen's thrift enabled her in ordinary times of peace to defray the current expenses of the crown from its ordinary revenues. But her thrift was dictated not so much by economy as by a desire to avoid summoning fresh parliaments. We have seen how boldly the genius of Thomas Cromwell set aside on this point the tradition of the new monarchy. His confidence in the power of the crown revived the parliament as an easy and manageable instrument of tyranny. The old forms of constitutional freedom were turned to the profit of the royal despotism, and a revolution which for the moment left England absolutely at Henry's feet was wrought out by a series of parliamentary statutes. Throughout Henry's reign Cromwell's confidence was justified by the spirit of slavish submission which pervaded the houses. But the effect of the religious change for which his measures made room began to be felt during the minority of Edward the Sixth; and the debates and divisions on the religious reaction which Mary pressed on the parliament were many and violent. A great step forward was marked by the effort of the crown to neutralize by "management" an opposition which it could no longer overawe. Not only was the parliament packed with nominees of the crown, but new constituencies were

created whose members would follow implicitly its will. For this purpose twenty-two new boroughs were created under Edward, fourteen under Mary; some, indeed, places entitled to representation by their wealth and population, but the bulk of them small towns or hamlets which lay wholly at the disposal of the royal council.

742. Elizabeth adopted the system of her two predecessors both in the creation of boroughs and the recommendation of candidates; but her keen political instinct soon perceived the inutility of both expedients. She saw that the "management" of the houses, so easy under Cromwell, was becoming harder every day. The very number of the members she called up into the commons from nomination boroughs, sixty-two in all, showed the increasing difficulty which the government found in securing a working majority. The rise of a new nobility, enriched by the spoils of the church and trained to political life by the stress of events around them, was giving fresh vigor to the house of lords. The increased wealth of the country gentry, as well as the growing desire to obtain a seat among the commons, brought about the cessation at this time of the old payment of members by their constituencies. A change, too, in the borough representation, which had long been in progress, but was now for the first time legally recognized, tended greatly to increase the vigor and independence of the lower house. By the terms of the older writs, borough members were required to be chosen from the body of the burgesses; and an act of Henry the Fifth gave this custom the force of law.

But the passing of such an act shows that the custom was already widely infringed, and by Elizabeth's day act and custom alike had ceased to have force. Most seats were now filled by representatives who were strange to the borough itself, and who were often nominees of the great landowners round. But they were commonly men of wealth and blood, whose aim in entering parliament was purely a political one, and whose attitude toward the crown was far bolder and more independent than that of the quiet tradesmen who preceded them. Elizabeth saw that "management" was of little avail with a house of members such as these; and she fell back as far as she could on Wolsey's policy of practical abolition. She summoned parliament at longer and longer intervals. By rigid economy, by a policy of balance and peace, she strove, and for a long time successfully strove, to avoid the necessity of assembling them at all. But Mary of Scotland and Philip of Spain proved friends to English liberty in its sorest need. The struggle with Catholicism forced Elizabeth to have more frequent recourse to her parliaments, and as she was driven to appeal for increasing supplies the tone of the houses rose higher and higher.

743. What made this revival of parliamentary independence more important was the range which Cromwell's policy had given to parliamentary action. In theory the Tudor statesman regarded three cardinal subjects, matters of trade, matters of religion, and matters of state, as lying exclusively within the competence of the crown. But in actual fact such

subjects had been treated by parliament after parliament. The whole religious fabric of the realm rested on parliamentary enactments. The very title of Elizabeth rested in a parliamentary statute. When the houses petitioned at the outset of her reign for the declaration of a successor, and for the queen's marriage, it was impossible for her to deny their right to intermeddle with these "matters of state," though she rebuked the demand and evaded an answer. But the question of the succession was a question too vital for English freedom and English religion to remain prisoned within Elizabeth's council-chamber. It came again to the front in the parliament which the pressure from Mary Stuart forced Elizabeth to assemble after six prorogations and an interval of four years, in September, 1566. The lower house at once resolved that the business of supply should go hand in hand with that of the succession. Such a step put a stress on the monarchy which it had never known since the wars of the Roses. The commons no longer confined themselves to limiting or resisting the policy of the crown; they dared to dictate it. Elizabeth's wrath showed her sense of the importance of their action. "They had acted like rebels!" she said; "they had dealt with her as they dared not have dealt with her father." "I cannot tell," she broke out angrily to the Spanish ambassador, "what these devils want!" "They want liberty, madam," replied the Spaniard, "and if princes do not look to themselves and work together to put such people down they will find before long what all this is coming to!" But Elizabeth had to

front more than her Puritan commons. The lords joined with the lower house in demanding the queen's marriage and a settlement of the succession, and after a furious burst of anger, Elizabeth gave a promise of marriage, which she was, no doubt, resolved to evade as she had evaded it before. But the subject of the succession was one which could not be evaded. Yet any decision on it meant civil war. It was notorious that if the commons were resolute to name the Lady Catharine Grey, the heiress of the house of Suffolk, successor to the throne, the lords were as resolute to assert the right of Mary Stuart. To settle such a matter was at once to draw the sword. The queen, therefore, peremptorily forbade the subject to be approached. But the royal message was no sooner delivered than Wentworth, a member of the house of commons, rose to ask whether such a prohibition was not "against the liberties of parliament." The question was followed by a hot debate, and a fresh message from the queen commanding "that there should be no further argument" was met by a request for freedom of deliberation, while the subsidy bill lay significantly unnoticed on the table. A new strife broke out when another member of the commons, Mr. Dalton, denounced the claims put forward by the Scottish queen. Elizabeth at once ordered him into arrest. But the commons prayed for leave "to confer upon their liberties," and the queen's prudence taught her that it was necessary to give way. She released Dalton; she protested to the commons that "she did not mean to prejudice any part of the liberties hereto-

fore granted them;" she softened the order of silence into a request. Won by the graceful concession, the lower house granted the subsidy and assented loyally to her wish. But the victory was none the less a real one. No such struggle had taken place between the crown and the commons since the beginning of the new monarchy; and the struggle had ended in the virtual defeat of the crown.

744. The strife with parliament hit Elizabeth hard. It was "secret foes at home," she told the house as the quarrel passed away in a warm reconciliation, "who thought to work me that mischief which never foreign enemies could bring to pass, which is the hatred of my commons. Do you think that either I am so unmindful of your surety by succession, wherein is all my care, or that I went about to break your liberties? No! it never was my meaning; but to stay you before you fell into the ditch." But it was impossible for her to explain the real reasons for her course; and the dissolution of the parliament in January, 1567, left her face to face with a national discontent added to the ever-deepening peril from without. To the danger from the north and from the east was added a danger from the west. The north of Ireland was in full revolt. From the moment of her accession Elizabeth had realized the risks of the policy of confiscation and colonization which had been pursued in the island by her predecessor: and the prudence of Cecil fell back on the safer though more tedious policy of Henry the Eighth. But the alarm at English aggression had already spread among the natives; and its result was

seen in a revolt of the north, and in the rise of a leader more vigorous and able than any with whom the government had had as yet to contend. An acceptance of the earldom of Tyrone by the chief of the O'Neills brought about the inevitable conflict between the system of succession recognized by English and that recognized by Irish law. On the death of the Earl of Tyrone, England acknowledged his eldest son as the heir of his earldom; while the sept of which he was the head maintained their older right of choosing a chief from among the members of the family, and preferred Shane O'Neill, a younger son of less doubtful legitimacy. The lord deputy, the Earl of Sussex, marched northward to settle the question by force of arms; but ere he could reach Ulster the activity of Shane had quelled the disaffection of his rivals, the O'Donnells of Donegal, and won over the Scots of Antrim. "Never before," wrote Sussex, "durst Scot or Irishman look Englishman in the face in plain or wood since I came here;" but Shane fired his men with a new courage, and charging the deputy's army with a force hardly half its number drove it back in rout on Armagh. A promise of pardon induced the Irish chieftain to visit London, and make an illusory submission, but he was no sooner safe home again than its terms were set aside; and after a wearisome struggle, in which Shane foiled the efforts of the lord deputy to entrap or to poison him, he remained virtually master of the north. His success stirred larger dreams of ambition. He invaded Connaught, and pressed Clanrickard hard; while he replied to the remonstrances

of the council at Dublin with a bold defiance. "By the sword I have won these lands," he answered, "and by the sword will I keep them." But defiance broke idly against the skill and vigor of Sir Henry Sidney, who succeeded Sussex as lord deputy. The rival septs of the north were drawn into a rising against O'Neill, while the English army advanced from the Pale; and in 1567 Shane, defeated by the O'Donnells, took refuge in Antrim, and was hewn to pieces in a drunken squabble by his Scottish entertainers.

745. The victory of Sidney marked the turn of the tide which had run so long against Elizabeth. The danger which England dreaded from Mary Stuart, the terror of a Catholic sovereign and a Catholic reaction, reached its height only to pass irretrievably away. At the moment when the Irish revolt was being trampled under foot a terrible event suddenly struck light through the gathering clouds in the north. Mary had used Darnley as a tool to bring about the ruin of his confederates and to further her policy; but from the moment that she discovered his actual complicity in the plot for Rizzio's murder she had loathed and avoided him. Ominous words dropped from her lips. "Unless she were free of him some way," Mary was heard to mutter, "she had no pleasure to live." The lords whom he had drawn into his plot only to desert and betray them hated him with as terrible a hatred, and in their longing for vengeance a new adventurer saw the road to power. Of all the border nobles James Hepburn, the Earl of Bothwell, was the boldest and most un-

scrupulous. But, Protestant as he was, he had never swerved from the side of the crown; he had supported the regent, and crossed the seas to pledge as firm a support to Mary; and his loyalty and daring alike appealed to the young queen's heart. Little as he was touched by Mary's passion, it stirred in the earl dreams of a union with the queen; and great as were the obstacles to such a union, which presented themselves in Mary's marriage and his own, Bothwell was of too desperate a temper to recoil before obstacles such as these. Divorce would free him from his own wife. To free himself from Darnley he seized on the hatred which the lords whom Darnley had deserted and betrayed bore to the king. Bothwell joined Murray and the English ambassador in praying for the recall of Morton and the exiles. The pardon was granted; the nobles returned to court, and the bulk of them joined readily in a conspiracy to strike down one whom they still looked on as their bitterest foe.

746. Morton alone stood aloof. He demanded an assurance of the queen's sanction to the deed; and no such assurance was given him. On the contrary, Mary's mood seemed suddenly to change. Her hatred to Darnley passed all at once into demonstration of the old affection. He had fallen sick with vice and misery, and she visited him on his sick-bed, and persuaded him to follow her to Edinburgh. She visited him again in a ruinous and lonely house near the palace in which he was lodged by her order, on the ground that its purer air would further his recovery, kissed him as she bade him farewell, and rode gayly

back to a wedding-dance at Holyrood. If Mary's passion had drawn her to share Bothwell's guilt, these acts were but awful preludes to her husband's doom. If, on the other hand, her reconciliation was a real one, it only drove Bothwell to hurry on his deed of blood without waiting for the aid of the nobles who had sworn the king's death. The terrible secret is still hid in a cloud of doubt and mystery which will probably never be wholly dispelled. But Mary had hardly returned to her palace when, two hours after midnight on the 9th of February, 1567, an awful explosion shook the city. The burghers rushed out from the gates to find the house of Kirk o' Field destroyed and Darnley's body dead beside the ruins.

747. The murder was undoubtedly the deed of Bothwell. It was soon known that his servant had stored the powder beneath the king's bed-chamber and that the earl had watched without the walls till the deed was done. But, in spite of gathering suspicion and of a charge of murder made formally against Bothwell by Lord Lennox, no serious steps were taken to investigate the crime; and a rumor that Mary purposed to marry the murderer drove her friends to despair. Her agent in England wrote to her that "if she married that man she would lose the favor of God, her own reputation, and the hearts of all England, Ireland, and Scotland." But whatever may have been the ties of passion or guilt which united them, Mary was now powerless in Bothwell's hands. While Murray withdrew to France on pretext of travel, the young earl used the plot against

Darnley into which he had drawn the lords to force from them a declaration that he was guiltless of the murder and their consent to his marriage with the queen. He boasted that he would marry Mary whether she would or no. Every stronghold in the kingdom was placed in his hands, and this step was the prelude to a trial and acquittal which the overwhelming force of his followers in Edinburgh turned into a bitter mockery. The Protestants were bribed by the assembling of a parliament in which Mary, for the first time, gave her sanction to the laws which established the reformation in Scotland. A shameless suit for his divorce removed the last obstacle to Bothwell's ambition; and a seizure of the queen as she rode to Linlithgow, whether real or fictitious, was followed three weeks later by their union on the 15th of May. Mary may have yielded to force; she may have yielded to passion; it is possible that in Bothwell's vigor she saw the means of at last mastering the kingdom and wreaking her vengeance on the lords. But, whatever were her hopes or fears, in a month more all was over. The horror at the queen's marriage with a man fresh from her husband's blood drove the whole nation to revolt. The Catholic party held aloof from a queen who seemed to have forsaken them by a Protestant marriage and by her acknowledgment of the Protestant church. The Protestant lords seized on the general horror to free themselves from a master whose subtlety and bloodshed had placed them at his feet. Morton and Argyll rallied the forces of the congregation at Stirling, and were soon joined by the bulk of the Scot-

tish nobles of either religion. Their entrance into Edinburgh roused the capital into insurrection. On the 15th of June, Mary and her husband advanced with a fair force to Seton to encounter the lords; but their men refused to fight, and Bothwell galloped off into lifelong exile, while the queen was brought back to Edinburgh in a frenzy of despair, tossing back wild words of defiance to the curses of the crowd.

---

## CHAPTER V.

### ENGLAND AND THE PAPACY.

1567-1582.

748. THE fall of Mary freed Elizabeth from the most terrible of her outer dangers. But it left her still struggling with ever-growing dangers at home. The religious peace for which she had fought so hard was drawing to an end. Sturdily as she might aver to her subjects that no change had really been made in English religion, that the old faith had only been purified, that the realm had only been freed from papal usurpation; jealously as she might preserve the old episcopate, the old service, the old vestments and usages of public worship, her action abroad told too plainly its tale. The world was slowly drifting to a gigantic conflict between the tradition of the past and a faith that rejected the tradition of the past; and in this conflict men saw that England was ranging itself, not on the side of the old belief, but of the new. The real meaning of Elizabeth's attitude was revealed in her refusal to own the Coun-

oil of Trent. From that moment the hold which she had retained on all who still clung strongly to Catholic doctrine was roughly shaken. Her system of conformity received a heavy blow from the decision of the papacy that attendance at the common prayer was unlawful. Her religious compromise was almost destroyed by the victory of the Guises. In the moment of peril she was driven on Protestant support, and Protestant support had to be bought by a test act, which excluded every zealous Catholic from all share in the government or administration of the realm, while the re-enactment of Edward's articles by the convocation of the clergy was an avowal of Protestantism which none could mistake. Whatever, in fact, might be Elizabeth's own predilections, even the most cautious of Englishmen could hardly doubt of the drift of her policy. The hopes which the party of moderation had founded on a marriage with Philip, or a marriage with the Austrian archduke, or a marriage with Dudley, had all passed away. The conciliatory efforts of Pope Pius had been equally fruitless. The last hope of a quiet undoing of the religious changes lay in the succession of Mary Stuart. But with the fall of Mary a peaceful return to the older faith became impossible; and the consciousness of this could hardly fail to wake new dangers for Elizabeth, whether at home or abroad.

749. It was, in fact, at this moment of seeming triumph that the great struggle of her reign began. In 1565 a pontiff was chosen to fill the papal chair whose policy was that of open war between England

and Rome. At no moment in its history had the fortunes of the Roman see sunk so low as at the accession of Pius the Fifth. The Catholic revival had as yet done nothing to arrest the march of the reformation. In less than half a century the new doctrines had spread from Iceland to the Pyrenees, and from Finland to the Alps. When Pius mounted the throne Lutheranism was firmly established in Scandinavia and in northern Germany. Along the eastern border of the empire it had conquered Livonia and Old Prussia; its adherents formed a majority of the nobles of Poland; Hungary seemed drifting toward heresy; and in Transylvania the diet had already confiscated all church lands. In central Germany the great prelates whose princedoms covered so large a part of Franconia opposed in vain the spread of Lutheran doctrine. It seemed as triumphant in southern Germany, for the duchy of Austria was for the most part Lutheran, and many of the Bavarian towns, with a large part of the Bavarian nobles, had espoused the cause of the reformation. In western Europe the fiercer doctrines of Calvinism took the place of the faith of Luther. At the death of Henry the Second, Calvin's missionaries poured from Geneva over France, and in a few years every province of the realm was dotted with Calvinistic churches. The Huguenots rose into a great political and religious party which struggled openly for the mastery of the realm, and wrested from the crown a legal recognition of its existence and of freedom of worship. The influence of France told quickly on the regions about it. The Rhine-land was fast losing its hold

on Catholicism. In the Netherlands, where the persecutions of Charles the Fifth had failed to check the upgrowth of heresy, his successor saw Calvinism win state after state, and gird itself to a desperate struggle at once for religious and for civil independence. Still further west a sudden revolution had won Scotland for the faith of Geneva; and a revolution hardly less sudden, though marked with consummate subtlety, had in effect added England to the churches of the reformation. Christendom, in fact, was almost lost to the papacy; for only two European countries owned its sway without dispute. "There remain firm to the pope," wrote a Venetian ambassador to his state, "only Spain and Italy, with some few islands, and those countries possessed by your serenity in Dalmatia and Greece."

750. It was at this moment of defeat that Pius the Fifth mounted the papal throne. His earlier life had been that of an inquisitor; and he combined the ruthlessness of a persecutor with the ascetic devotion of a saint. Pius had but one end,—that of reconquering Christendom, of restoring the rebel nations to the fold of the church, and of stamping out heresy by fire and sword. To his fiery faith every means of warfare seemed hallowed by the sanctity of his cause. The despotism of the prince, the passion of the populace, the sword of the mercenary, the very dagger of the assassin, were all seized without scruple as weapons in the warfare of God. The ruthlessness of the inquisitor was turned into the world-wide policy of the papacy. When Philip doubted how to deal with the troubles in the

Netherlands, Pius bade him deal with them by force of arms. When the pope sent soldiers of his own to join the Catholics in France he bade their leader "slay instantly whatever heretic fell into his hands." The massacres of Alva were rewarded by a gift of the consecrated hat and sword, as the massacre of St. Bartholomew was hailed by the successor of Pius with a solemn thanksgiving. The force of the pope's effort lay in its concentration of every energy on a single aim. Rome drew, in fact, a new power from the ruin of her schemes of secular aggrandizement. The narrower hopes and dreads which had sprung from their position as Italian princes told no longer on the popes. All hope of the building up of a wider principedom passed away. The hope of driving the stranger from Italy came equally to an end. But, on the other hand, Rome was screened from the general conflicts of the secular powers. It was enabled to be the friend of every Catholic state, and that at a moment when every Catholic state saw in the rise of Calvinism a new cause for seeking its friendship. Calvinism drew with it a thirst for political liberty, and religious revolution became the prelude to political revolution. From this moment, therefore, the cause of the papacy became the cause of kings, and a craving for self-preservation rallied the Catholic princes round the papal throne. The same dread of utter ruin rallied round it the Catholic church. All strife, all controversy, was hushed in the presence of the foe. With the close of the Council of Trent came a unity of feeling and of action such as had never been seen before. Faith was

defined. The papal authority stood higher than ever. The bishops owned themselves to be delegates of the Roman see. The clergy were drawn together into a disciplined body by the institution of seminaries. The new religious orders carried everywhere the watchword of implicit obedience. As the heresy of Calvin pressed on to one victory after another, the Catholic world drew closer and closer round the standard of Rome.

751. What raised the warfare of Pius into grandeur was the scale upon which he warred. His hand was everywhere throughout Christendom. Under him Rome became the political as well as the religious center of western Europe. The history of the papacy widened again, as in the middle ages, into the history of the world. Every scheme of the Catholic resistance was devised or emboldened at Rome. While her Jesuit emissaries won a new hold in Bavaria and southern Germany, rolled back the tide of Protestantism in the Rhine-land, and by school and pulpit labored to re-Catholicize the empire, Rome spurred Mary Stuart to the Darnley marriage, urged Philip to march Alva on the Netherlands, broke up the religious truce which Catharine had won for France, and celebrated with solemn pomp the massacre of the Huguenots. England above all was the object of papal attack. The realm of Elizabeth was too important for the general papal scheme of reconquering Christendom to be lightly let go. England alone could furnish a center to the reformed communions of western Europe. The Lutheran states of north Germany were too small. The Scandinavian king-

doms were too remote. Scotland hardly ranked as yet as a European power. Even if France joined the new movement her influence would long be neutralized by the strife of the religious parties within her pale. But England was, to outer seeming, a united realm. Her government held the country firmly in hand. Whether as an island or from her neighborhood to the chief centers of the religious strife, she was so placed as to give an effective support to the new opinions. Protestant refugees found a safe shelter within her bounds. Her trading ships diffused heresy in every port they touched at. She could, at little risk, feed the Calvinistic revolution in France or the Netherlands. In the great battle of the old faith and the new, England was thus the key of the reformed position. With England Protestant the fight against Protestantism could only be a slow and doubtful one. On the other hand, a Catholic England would render religious revolution in the west all but hopeless. Hand in hand with Philip religiously, as she already was politically, the great island might turn the tide of the mighty conflict which had so long gone against the papacy.

752. It was from this sense of the importance of England in the world-wide struggle which it was preparing that Rome had watched with such a feverish interest the effort of Mary Stuart. Her victory would have given to Catholicism the two westernmost realms of the reformation, England and Scotland; it would have aided it in the reconquest of the Netherlands and of France. No formal bond indeed, such as the Calvinists believed to exist, bound

Mary and Pius and Philip and Catharine of Medicis together in a vast league for the restoration of the faith: their difference of political aim held France and Spain obstinately apart both from each other and from Mary Stuart, and it was only at the Vatican that the great movement was conceived as a whole. But practically the policy of Mary and Philip worked forward to the same end. While the Scottish queen prepared her counter-reformation in England and Scotland, Philip was gathering a formidable host which was to suppress Calvinism as well as liberty in the Netherlands. Of the seventeen provinces which Philip had inherited from his father, Charles, in this part of his dominions, each had its own constitution, its own charter and privileges, its own right of taxation. All clung to their local independence; and resistance to any projects of centralization was common to the great nobles and the burghers of the towns. Philip, on the other hand, was resolute to bring them by gradual steps to the same level of absolute subjection and incorporation in the body of the monarchy as the provinces of Castile. The Netherlands were the wealthiest part of his dominions. Flanders alone contributed more to his exchequer than all his kingdoms in Spain. With a treasury drained by a thousand schemes Philip longed to have this wealth at his unfettered disposal, while his absolutism recoiled from the independence of the states, and his bigotry drove him to tread their heresy under foot. Policy backed the impulses of greed and fanaticism. In the strangely mingled mass of the Spanish monarchy, the one bond which

held together its various parts, divided as they were by blood, by tradition, by tongue, was their common faith. Philip was in more than name the "Catholic king." Catholicism alone united the burgher of the Netherlands to the nobles of Castile, or Milanese and Neapolitan to the Aztec of Mexico and Peru. With such an empire heresy meant to Philip political chaos; and the heresy of Calvin, with its ready organization and its doctrine of resistance, promised not only chaos but active revolt. In spite, therefore, of the growing discontent in the Netherlands, in spite of the alienation of the nobles and the resistance of the estates, he clung to a system of government which ignored the liberties of every province, and to a persecution which drove thousands of skilled workmen to the shores of England.

753. At last the general discontent took shape in open resistance. The success of the French Huguenots in wresting the free exercise of their faith from the monarchy told on the Calvinists of the Low Countries. The nobles gathered in leagues. Riots broke out in the towns. The churches were sacked, and heretic preachers preached in the open fields to multitudes who carried weapons to protect them. If Philip's system was to continue it must be by force of arms, and the king seized the disturbances as a pretext for dealing a blow he had long meditated at the growing heresy of this portion of his dominions. Pius the Fifth pressed him to deal with heresy by the sword, and in 1567 an army of 10,000 men gathered in Italy under the Duke of Alva for a march on the Low Countries. Had Alva reached the

Netherlands while Mary was still in the flush of her success, it is hard to see how England could have been saved. But again fortune proved Elizabeth's friend. The passion of Mary shattered the hopes of Catholicism, and, at the moment when Alva led his troops over the Alps, Mary passed a prisoner within the walls of Lochleven. Alone, however, the duke was a mighty danger; nor could any event have been more embarrassing to Elizabeth than his arrival in the Netherlands in the autumn of 1567. The terror he inspired hushed all thought of resistance. The towns were occupied. The heretics were burned. The greatest nobles were sent to the block or driven, like William of Orange, from the country. The Netherlands lay at Philip's feet; and Alva's army lowered like a thunder-cloud over the Protestant west.

754. The triumph of Catholicism and the presence of a Catholic army in a country so closely connected with England at once revived the dreams of a Catholic rising against Elizabeth's throne, while the news of Alva's massacres stirred in every one of her Protestant subjects a thirst for revenge which it was hard to hold in check. Yet to strike a blow at Alva was impossible. Antwerp was the great mart of English trade, and a stoppage of the trade with Flanders, such as war must bring about, would have broken half the merchants in London. Elizabeth could only look on while the duke trod resistance and heresy under foot, and prepared in the Low Countries a securer starting-point for his attack on Protestantism in the west. With Elizabeth, indeed, or her

cautious and moderate Lutheranism, Philip had as yet little will to meddle, however hotly Rome might urge him to attack her. He knew that the Calvinism of the Netherlands looked for support to the Calvinism of France; and as soon as Alva's work was done in the Low Countries the duke had orders to aid the Guises in assailing the Huguenots. But the terror of the Huguenots precipitated the strife, and while Alva was still busy with attacks from the patriots under the princes of the house of Orange, a fresh rising in France woke the civil war at the close of 1567. Catharine lulled this strife for the moment by a new edict of toleration; but the presence of Alva was stirring hopes and fears in other lands than France. Between Mary Stuart and the lords who had imprisoned her in Lochleven reconciliation was impossible. Elizabeth, once lightened of her dread from Mary, would have been content with a restoration of Murray's actual supremacy. Already alarmed by Calvinistic revolt against monarchy in France, she was still more alarmed by the success of Calvinistic revolt against monarchy in Scotland; and the presence of Alva in the Netherlands made her anxious above all to settle the troubles in the north and to devise some terms of reconciliation between Mary and her subjects. But it was in vain that she demanded the release of the queen. The Scotch Protestants, with Knox at their head, called loudly for Mary's death as a murderess. If the lords shrank from such extremities, they had no mind to set her free and to risk their heads for Elizabeth's pleasure. As the price of her life, they forced

Mary to resign her crown in favor of her child, and to name Murray, who was now returning from France, as regent during his minority. In July, 1567, the babe was solemnly crowned as James the Sixth.

755. But Mary had only consented to abdicate because she felt sure of escape. With an infant king the regency of Murray promised to be a virtual sovereignty; and the old factions of Scotland woke again into life. The house of Hamilton, which stood next in succession to the throne, became the center of a secret league which gathered to it the nobles and prelates who longed for the re-establishment of Catholicism, and who saw in Alva's triumph a pledge of their own. The regent's difficulties were doubled by the policy of Elizabeth. Her wrath at the revolt of subjects against their queen, her anxiety that "by this example none of her own be encouraged," only grew with the disregard of her protests and threats. In spite of Cecil she refused to recognize Murray's government, renewed her demands for the queen's release, and encouraged the Hamiltons in their designs of freeing her. She was, in fact, stirred by more fears than her dread of Calvinism and of Calvinistic liberty. Philip's triumph in the Netherlands and the presence of his army across the sea were filling the Catholics of the northern counties with new hopes, and scaring Elizabeth from any joint action with the Scotch Calvinists which might call the Spanish forces over sea. She even stooped to guard against any possible projects of Philip by fresh negotiations for a marriage with one of the Austrian arch-

dukes. But the negotiation proved as fruitless as before, while Scotland moved boldly forward in its new career. A parliament which assembled at the opening of 1568 confirmed the deposition of the queen, and made Catholic worship punishable with the pain of death. The triumph of Calvinistic bigotry only hastened the outbreak which had long been preparing, and at the beginning of May an escape of Mary from her prison was a signal for civil war. Five days later 6,000 men gathered round her at Hamilton, and Argyle joined the Catholic lords who rallied to her banner. The news found different welcomes at the English court. Elizabeth at once offered to arbitrate between Mary and her subjects. Cecil, on the other hand, pressed Murray to strike quick and hard. But the regent needed little pressing. Surprised as he was, Murray was quickly in arms; and, cutting off Mary's force as it moved on Dumbarton, he brought it to battle at Langside on the Clyde on the 18th of May, and broke it in a panic-stricken rout. Mary herself, after a fruitless effort to reach Dumbarton, fled southward to find a refuge in Galloway. A ride of ninety miles brought her to the Solway, but she found her friends wavering in her support and ready to purchase pardon from Murray by surrendering her into the regent's hands. From that moment she abandoned all hope from Scotland. She believed that Elizabeth would in the interests of monarchy restore her to the throne; and changing her designs with the rapidity of genius, she pushed in a light boat across the Solway, and was safe before the evening fell in the castle of Carlisle.

756. The presence of Alva in Flanders was a far less peril than the presence of Mary in Carlisle. To restore her, as she demanded, by force of arms was impossible. If Elizabeth was zealous for the cause of monarchy, she had no mind to crush the nobles who had given her security against her rival, simply to seat that rival triumphantly on the throne. On the other hand, to retain her in England was to furnish a center for revolt. Mary herself, indeed, threatened that "if they kept her prisoner they should have enough to do with her." If the queen would not aid in her restoration to the throne, she demanded a free passage to France. But compliance with such a request would have given the Guises a terrible weapon against Elizabeth, and have insured French intervention in Scotland. For a while Elizabeth hoped to bring Murray to receive Mary back peaceably as queen. But the regent refused to sacrifice himself and the realm to Elizabeth's policy. When the Duke of Norfolk with other commissioners appeared at York to hold a formal inquiry into Mary's conduct with a view to her restoration, Murray openly charged the queen with a share in the murder of her husband, and he produced letters from her to Bothwell, which if genuine substantiated the charge. Till Mary was cleared of guilt, Murray would hear nothing of her return, and Mary refused to submit to such a trial as would clear her. So eager, however, was Elizabeth to get rid of the pressing peril of her presence in England that Mary's refusal to submit to any trial only drove her to fresh devices for her restoration. She urged upon Murray

the suppression of the graver charges, and upon Mary the leaving Murray in actual possession of the royal power as the price of her return. Neither, however, would listen to terms which sacrificed both to Elizabeth's self-interest. The regent persisted in charging the queen with murder and adultery. Mary refused either to answer or to abdicate in favor of her infant son.

757. The triumph, indeed, of her bold policy was best advanced, as the Queen of Scots had no doubt foreseen, by simple inaction. Her misfortunes, her resolute denials, were gradually wiping away the stain of her guilt and winning back the Catholics of England to her cause. Already there were plans for her marriage with Norfolk, the head of the English nobles, as for her marriage with the heir of the Hamiltons. The first match might give her the English crown, the second could hardly fail to restore her to the crown of Scotland. In any case her presence, rousing as it did fresh hopes of a Catholic reaction, put pressure on her sister-queen. Elizabeth "had the wolf by the ears," while the fierce contest which Alva's presence roused in France and in the Netherlands was firing the temper of the two great parties in England. In the court, as in the country, the forces of progress and of resistance stood at last in sharp and declared opposition to each other. Cecil, at the head of the Protestants, demanded a general alliance with the Protestant churches throughout Europe, a war in the Low Countries against Alva, and the unconditional surrender of Mary to her Scotch subjects for the punishment she deserved.

•

The Catholics, on the other hand, backed by the mass of the conservative party with the Duke of Norfolk at its head, and supported by the wealthy merchants, who dreaded the ruin of the Flemish trade, were as earnest in demanding the dismissal of Cecil and the Protestants from the council-board, a steady peace with Spain, and, though less openly, a recognition of Mary's succession. Elizabeth was driven to temporize as before. She refused Cecil's counsels; but she sent money and arms to Condé, and hampered Alva by seizing treasure on its way to him, and by pushing the quarrel even to a temporary embargo on shipping either side the sea. She refused the counsels of Norfolk; but she would hear nothing of a declaration of war, or give any judgment on the charges against the Scottish queen, or recognize the accession of James in her stead.

758. But to the pressure of Alva and Mary was now added the pressure of Rome. With the triumph of Philip in the Netherlands, and of the Guises in France, Pius the Fifth held that the time had come for a decisive attack on Elizabeth. If Philip held back from playing the champion of Catholicism, if even the insults to Alva failed to stir him to active hostility, Rome could still turn to its adherents within the realm. Pius had already sent two envoys in 1567 with powers to absolve the English Catholics who had attended church from their schism, but to withdraw all hope of future absolution for those who continued to conform. The result of their mission, however, had been so small that it was necessary to go further. The triumph of Alva in the Netherlands,

the failure of the Prince of Orange in an attempt to rescue them from the Spanish army, the terror-struck rising of the French Huguenots, the growing embarrassments of Elizabeth, both at home and abroad, seemed to offer Rome its opportunity of delivering a final blow. In February, 1569, the queen was declared a heretic by a bull which asserted in their strongest form the papal claims to a temporal supremacy over princes. As a heretic and ex-communicate, she was "deprived of her pretended right to the said kingdom," her subjects were absolved from allegiance to her, commanded "not to dare to obey her," and anathematized if they did obey. The bull was not as yet promulgated, but Dr. Morton was sent into England to denounce the queen as fallen from her usurped authority, and to promise the speedy issue of the sentence of deposition. The religious pressure was backed by political intrigue. Ridolfi, an Italian merchant settled in London, who had received full powers and money from Rome, knit the threads of a Catholic revolt in the north, and drew the Duke of Norfolk into correspondence with Mary Stuart. The duke was the son of Lord Surrey, and grandson of the Norfolk who had headed the conservative party through the reign of Henry the Eighth. Like the rest of the English peers, he had acquiesced in the religious compromise of the queen. It was as a Protestant that the more conservative among his fellow-nobles now supported a project for his union with the Scottish queen. With an English and Protestant husband it was thought that Murray and the lords might safely take back *Mary*

to the Scottish throne, and England again accept her as the successor to her crown. But Norfolk was not contented with a single game. From the pope and Philip he sought aid in his marriage-plot as a Catholic at heart, whose success would bring about a restoration of Catholicism throughout the realm. With the Catholic lords he plotted the overthrow of Cecil, and the renewal of friendship with Spain. To carry out schemes such as these, however, required a temper of subtler and bolder stamp than the duke's; Cecil found it easy by playing on his greed to part him from his fellow-nobles; his marriage with Mary as a Protestant was set aside by Murray's refusal to accept her as queen; and Norfolk promised to enter into no correspondence with Mary Stuart but with Elizabeth's sanction.

759. The hope of a crown, whether in Scotland or at home, proved too great, however, for his good faith, and Norfolk was soon wrapped anew in the net of papal intrigue. But it was not so much on Norfolk that Rome counted as on the nobles of the north. The three great houses of the northern border—the Cliffords of Cumberland, the Nevilles of Westmoreland, the Percys of Northumberland—had remained Catholics at heart; and from the moment of Mary's entrance into England they had been only waiting for a signal of revolt. They looked for foreign aid, and foreign aid now seemed assured. In spite of Elizabeth's help, the civil war in France went steadily against the Huguenots. In March, 1569, their army was routed at Jarnac, and their leader, Condé, left dead on the field. The joy with which

the victory was greeted by the English Catholics sprang from a consciousness that the victors looked on it as a prelude to their attack on Protestantism across the sea. No sooner, indeed, was this triumph won than Mary's uncle, the Cardinal of Lorraine, as the head of the house of Guise, proposed to Philip to complete the victory of Catholicism by uniting the forces of France and Spain against Elizabeth. The moment was one of peril such as England had never known. Norfolk was still pressing forward to a marriage with Mary; he was backed by the second great conservative peer, Lord Arundel, and supported by a large part of the nobles. The northern earls, with Lords Montague and Lumley, and the head of the great house of Dacres, were ready to take up arms, and sure—as they believed—of the aid of the Earls of Derby and Shrewsbury. Both parties of plotters sought Philip's sanction, and placed themselves at his disposal. A descent of French and Spanish troops would have called both to the field. But much as Philip longed for a triumph of religion, he had no mind of a triumph of France. France now meant the Guises, and to set their niece, Mary Stuart, on the English throne was to insure the close union of England and the France they ruled. Though he suffered Alva, therefore, to plan the dispatch of a force from the Netherlands should a Catholic revolt prove successful, he refused to join in a French attack.

760. But the papal exhortations and the victories of the Guises did their work without Philip's aid. The conspirators of the north only waited for Nor-

folk's word to rise in arms. But the duke dissembled and delayed, while Elizabeth, roused at last to her danger, struck quick and hard. Mary Stuart was given in charge to the Puritan Lord Huntingdon. The Earls of Arundel and Pembroke, with Lord Lumley, were secured. Norfolk himself, summoned peremptorily to court, dared not disobey; and found himself at the opening of October a prisoner in the Tower. The more dangerous plot was foiled, for, whatever were Norfolk's own designs, the bulk of his conservative partisans were good Protestants, and their aim of securing the succession by a Protestant marriage for Mary was one with which the bulk of the nation would have sympathized. But the Catholic plot remained; and in October the hopes of its leaders were stirred afresh by a new defeat of the Huguenots at Montcontour; while a papal envoy, Dr. Morton, goaded them to action by news that a bull of deposition was ready at Rome. At last a summons to court tested the loyalty of the earls, and on the 10th of November, 1569, Northumberland gave the signal for a rising. He was at once joined by the Earl of Westmoreland, and in a few days the earls entered Durham and called the north to arms. They shrank from an open revolt against the queen, and demanded only the dismissal of her ministers, and the recognition of Mary's right of succession. But with these demands went a pledge to re-establish the Catholic religion. The Bible and prayer-book were torn to pieces, and mass said once more at the altar of Durham cathedral, before the earls pushed on to Doncaster with an army which soon swelled

to thousands of men. Their cry was, "To reduce all causes of religion to the old custom and usage;" and the Earl of Sussex, her general in the north, wrote frankly to Elizabeth that "there were not ten gentlemen in Yorkshire that did allow [approve] her proceedings in the cause of religion." But he was as loyal as he was frank, and held York stoutly while the queen ordered Mary's hasty removal to a new prison at Coventry. The storm, however, broke as rapidly as it had gathered. Leonard Dacres held aloof. Lord Derby proved loyal. The Catholic lords of the south refused to stir without help from Spain. The mass of the Catholics throughout the country made no sign; and the earls no sooner halted irresolute in presence of this unexpected inaction than their army caught the panic and dispersed. Northumberland and Westmoreland fled in the middle of December, and were followed in their flight by Leonard Dacres of Naworth, while their miserable adherents paid for their disloyalty in bloodshed and ruin.

761. The ruthless measures of repression which followed this revolt were the first breach in the clemency of Elizabeth's rule. But they were signs of terror which were not lost on her opponents. It was the general inaction of the Catholics which had foiled the hopes of the northern earls; and Pope Pius resolved to stir them to activity by publishing in March, 1570, the bull of excommunication and deposition which had been secretly issued in the preceding year. In his bull, Pius declared that Elizabeth had forfeited all right to the throne, released her subjects

from their oath of allegiance to her, and forbade her nobles and people to obey her on pain of excommunication. In spite of the efforts of the government to prevent the entry of any copies of this sentence into the realm, the bull was found nailed, in a spirit of ironical defiance, on the Bishop of London's door. Its effect was far from being what Rome desired. With the exception of one or two zealots, the English Catholics treated the bull as a dead letter. The duty of obeying the queen seemed a certain thing to them, while that of obeying the pope in temporal matters was denied by most and doubted by all. Its spiritual effect, indeed, was greater. The bull dealt a severe blow to the religious truce which Elizabeth had secured. In the north the Catholics withdrew stubbornly from the national worship, and everywhere throughout the realm an increase in the number of recusants showed the obedience of a large body of Englishmen to the papal command. To the minds of English statesmen such an obedience to the papal bidding in matters of religion only heralded an obedience to the papal bidding in matters of state. In issuing the bull of deposition, Pius had declared war upon the queen. He had threatened her throne. He had called on her subjects to revolt. If his secret pressure had stirred the rising of the northern earls, his open declaration of war might well rouse a general insurrection of Catholics throughout the realm, while the plots of his agents threatened the queen's life.

762. How real was the last danger was shown at this moment by the murder of Murray. In January,

1570, a Catholic partisan, James Hamilton, shot the regent in the streets of Linlithgow; and Scotland plunged at once into war between the adherents of Mary and those of her son. The blow broke Elizabeth's hold on Scotland at a moment when conspiracy threatened her hold on England itself. The defeat of the earls had done little to check the hopes of the Roman court. Its intrigues were busier than ever. At the close of the rising, Norfolk was released from the Tower, but he was no sooner free than he renewed his correspondence with the Scottish queen. Mary consented to wed him, and the duke, who still professed himself a Protestant, trusted to carry the bulk of the English nobles with him in pressing a marriage which seemed to take Mary out of the hands of French and Catholic intriguers, to make her an Englishwoman, and to settle the vexed question of the succession to the throne. But it was only to secure this general adhesion that Norfolk delayed to declare himself a Catholic. He sought the pope's approval of his plans, and appealed to Philip for the intervention of a Spanish army. At the head of this appeal stood the name of Mary; while Norfolk's name was followed by those of many lords of "the old blood," as the prouder peers styled themselves. The significance of the request was heightened by gatherings of Catholic refugees at Antwerp, in the heart of Philip's dominions in the Low Countries, round the fugitive leaders of the northern revolt. The intervention of the pope was brought to quicken Philip's slow designs. Ridolfi, as the agent of the conspirators, appeared at Rome and laid before Pius

their plans for the marriage of Norfolk and Mary, the union of both realms under the duke and the Scottish queen, and the seizure of Elizabeth and her counselors at one of the royal country-houses. Pius backed the project with his warm approval, and Ridolfi hurried to secure the needful aid from Philip of Spain.

763. Enough of these conspiracies was discovered to rouse a fresh ardor in the menaced Protestants. While Ridolfi was negotiating at Rome and Madrid, the parliament met to pass an act of attainder against the northern earls, and to declare the introduction of papal bulls into the country an act of high treason. It was made treason to call the queen heretic or schismatic, or to deny her right to the throne. The rising indignation against Mary, as "the daughter of debate, who discord fell doth sow," was shown in a statute which declared any person who laid claim to the crown during the queen's lifetime incapable of ever succeeding to it. The disaffection of the Catholics was met by imposing on all magistrates and public officers the obligation of subscribing to the articles of faith, a measure which, in fact, transferred the administration of justice and public order to their Protestant opponents, by forbidding conversions to Catholicism or the bringing into England of papal absolutions or objects consecrated by the pope. Meanwhile Ridolfi was struggling in vain against Philip's caution. The king made no objection to the seizure or assassination of Elizabeth. The scheme secured his fullest sympathy; no such opportunity, he held, would ever offer again; and he longed to

finish the affair quickly before France should take part in it. But he could not be brought to send troops to England before Elizabeth was secured. If troops were once sent, the failure of the plot would mean war with England; and with fresh troubles threatening Alva's hold on the Netherlands, Philip had no mind to risk an English war. Norfolk, on the other hand, had no mind to risk a rising before Spanish troops were landed, and Ridolfi's efforts failed to bring either duke or king to action. But the clue to these negotiations had long been in Cecil's hands; and at the opening of 1571 Norfolk's schemes of ambition were foiled by his arrest. He was convicted of treason, and after a few months' delay executed at the Tower.

764. With the death of Norfolk and that of Northumberland, who followed him to the scaffold, the dread of revolt within the realm which had so long hung over England passed quietly away. The failure of the two attempts not only showed the weakness and disunion of the party of discontent and reaction, but it revealed the weakness of all party feeling before the rise of a national temper which was springing naturally out of the peace of Elizabeth's reign, and which a growing sense of danger to the order and prosperity around it was fast turning into a passionate loyalty to the queen. It was not merely against Cecil's watchfulness or Elizabeth's cunning that Mary and Philip and the Percys dashed themselves in vain; it was against a new England. And this England owed its existence to the queen. "I have desired," Elizabeth said proudly to her parlia-

ment, "to have the obedience of my subjects by love and not by compulsion." Through the fourteen years which had passed since she mounted the throne, her subjects' love had been fairly won by justice and good government. The current of political events had drawn men's eyes chiefly to the outer dangers of the country, to the policy of Philip and of Rome, to the revolutions of France, to the pressure from Mary Stuart. No one had watched these outer dangers so closely as the queen. But buried as she seemed in foreign negotiations and intrigues, Elizabeth was above all an English sovereign. She devoted herself ably and energetically to the task of civil administration. At the first moment of relief from the pressure of outer troubles, after the treaty of Edinburgh, she faced the two main causes of internal disorder. The debasement of the coinage was brought to an end in 1560. In 1561 a commission was issued to inquire into the best means of facing the problem of social pauperism.

765. Time and the natural development of new branches of industry were working quietly for the relief of the glutted labor market; but a vast mass of disorder still existed in England, which found a constant ground of resentment in the inclosures and evictions which accompanied the progress of agricultural change. It was on this host of "broken men" that every rebellion could count for support; their mere existence was an encouragement to civil war; while in peace their presence was felt in the insecurity of life and property, in bands of marauders which held whole counties in terror, and in

"sturdy beggars" who stripped travelers on the road. Under Elizabeth, as under her predecessors, the terrible measures of repression, whose uselessness More had in vain pointed out, went pitilessly on. We find the magistrates of Somersetshire capturing a gang of a hundred at a stroke, hanging fifty at once on the gallows, and complaining bitterly to the council of the necessity for waiting till the assizes before they could enjoy the spectacle of the fifty others hanging beside them. But the government were dealing with the difficulty in a wiser and more effectual way. The old powers to enforce labor on the idle and settlement on the vagrant class which had been given by statutes of Henry the Eighth were continued; and each town and parish was held responsible for the relief of its indigent and disabled poor, as well as for the employment of able-bodied mendicants. But a more efficient machinery was gradually devised for carrying out the relief and employment of the poor. Funds for this purpose had been provided by the collection of alms in church; but by an act of 1562 the mayor of each town and the church-wardens of each country parish were directed to draw up lists of all inhabitants able to contribute to such a fund, and on a persistent refusal the justices in sessions were empowered to assess the offender at a fitting sum and to enforce its payment by imprisonment.

766. The principles embodied in these measures, that of local responsibility for local distress, and that of a distinction between the pauper and the vagabond, were more clearly defined in a statute of 1572.

---

By this act the justices in the country districts, and mayors and other officers in towns, were directed to register the impotent poor, to settle them in fitting habitations, and to assess all inhabitants for their support. Overseers were appointed to enforce and superintend their labor, for which wool, hemp, flax, or other stuff was to be provided at the expense of the inhabitants; and houses of correction were established in every county for obstinate vagabonds or for paupers refusing to work at the overseer's bidding. A subsequent act transferred to these overseers the collection of the poor-rate, and powers were given to bind poor children as apprentices, to erect buildings for the improvident poor, and to force the parents and children of such paupers to maintain them. The well-known act which matured and finally established this system, the forty-third of Elizabeth, remained the basis of our system of pauper-administration until a time within the recollection of living men. Whatever flaws a later experience has found in these measures, their wise and humane character formed a striking contrast to the legislation which had degraded our statute-book from the date of the statute of laborers; and their efficacy at the time was proved by the cessation of the social danger against which they were intended to provide.

767. Its cessation, however, was owing not merely to law, but to the natural growth of wealth and industry throughout the country. A middle class of wealthier landowners and merchants was fast rising into importance. "The wealth of the meaner sort," wrote one to Cecil, "is the very fount of rebellion,

the occasion of their indolence, of the contempt of the nobility, and of the hatred they have conceived against them." But Cecil and his mistress could watch the upgrowth of national wealth with cooler eyes. In the country its effect was to undo much of the evil which the diminution of small holdings had done. Whatever social embarrassment it might bring about, the revolution in agriculture, which Latimer deplored, undoubtedly favored production. Not only was a larger capital brought to bear upon the land, but the mere change in the system of cultivation introduced a taste for new and better modes of farming; the breed of horses and of cattle was improved, and a far greater use made of manure and dressings. One acre under the new system produced, it was said, as much as two under the old. As a more careful and constant cultivation was introduced, a greater number of hands came to be required on every farm; and much of the surplus labor which had been flung off the land in the commencement of the new system was thus recalled to it.

768. A yet more efficient agency in absorbing the unemployed was found in the development of manufactures. The linen trade was as yet of small value, and that of silk-weaving was only just introduced. But the woolen manufacture was fast becoming an important element in the national wealth. England no longer sent her fleeces to be woven in Flanders and to be dyed at Florence. The spinning of yarn, the weaving, fulling, and dyeing of cloth, were spreading rapidly from the towns over the countryside. The worsted trade, of which Norwich was

the center, extended over the whole of the eastern counties. Farmers' wives began everywhere to spin their wool from their own sheeps' backs into a coarse "home-spun." The south and the west, however, still remained the great seats of industry and of wealth, for they were the homes of mining and manufacturing activity. The iron manufactures were limited to Kent and Sussex, though their prosperity in this quarter was already threatened by the growing scarcity of the wood which fed their furnaces, and by the exhaustion of the forests of the Weald. Cornwall was then, as now, the sole exporter of tin; and the exportation of its copper was just beginning. The broadcloths of the west claimed the palm among the woolen stuffs of England. The Cinque Ports held almost a monopoly of the commerce of the channel. Every little harbor from the Foreland to the Land's End sent out its fleets of fishing-boats, manned with bold seamen who were to furnish crews for Drake and the buccaneers. Northern England still lagged far behind the rest of the realm in its industrial activity. But in the reign of Elizabeth the poverty and inaction to which it had been doomed for so many centuries began at last to be broken. We see the first sign of the revolution which has transferred English manufactures and English wealth to the north of the Mersey and of the Humber in the mention which now meets us of the friezes of Manchester, the coverlets of York, the cutlery of Sheffield, and the cloth trade of Halifax.

769. The growth, however, of English commerce

far outstripped as yet that of its manufactures. We must not judge of it by any modern standard; for the whole population of the country can hardly have exceeded five or six millions, and the burthen of all the vessels engaged in ordinary commerce was estimated at little more than fifty thousand tons. The size of the vessels employed in it would nowadays seem insignificant; a modern collier brig is probably as large as the biggest merchant vessel which then sailed from the port of London. But it was under Elizabeth that English commerce began the rapid career of development which has made us the carriers of the world. The foundation of the Royal Exchange at London by Sir Thomas Gresham in 1566 was a mark of the commercial progress of the time. By far the most important branch of our trade was the commerce with Flanders. Antwerp and Bruges were, in fact, the general marts of the world in the early part of the sixteenth century, and the annual export of English wool and drapery to their markets was estimated at a sum of more than two millions in value. But the religious troubles of the Netherlands were already scaring capital and industry from their older seats. As early as 1560 Philip's envoy reported to his master that "ten thousand of your majesty's servants in the Low Countries are already in England with their preachers and ministers." Alva's severities soon raised the number of refugees to fifty thousand; and the outbreak of war which followed drove trade as well as traders from the Low Countries. It was with the ruin of Antwerp at the time of its siege and

capture by the Duke of Parma that the commercial supremacy of our own capital was first established. A third of the merchants and manufacturers of the ruined city are said to have found a refuge on the banks of the Thames. The export trade to Flanders died away as London developed into the general mart of Europe, where the gold and sugar of the New World were found side by side with the cotton of India, the silks of the east, and the woollen stuffs of England itself.

770. Not only was much of the world's older trade transferred by this change to English shores, but the burst of national vigor which characterized the time found new outlets for its activity. The fisheries grew more and more valuable. Those of the channel and the German ocean gave occupation to the ports which lined the coast from Yarmouth to Plymouth Haven; while Bristol and Chester were rivals in the fisheries of Ulster. The merchant-navy of England was fast widening its sphere of commerce. The Venetian carrying fleet still touched at Southampton; but as far back as the reign of Henry the Seventh a commercial treaty had been concluded with Florence, and the trade with the Mediterranean which began under Richard the Third constantly took a wider development. The trade between England and the Baltic ports had hitherto been conducted by the Hanseatic merchants; but the extinction at this time of their London depot, the steel yard, was a sign that this trade, too, had now passed into English hands. The growth of Boston and Hull marked an increase of commercial intercourse

with the Scandinavian states. The prosperity of Bristol, which depended in great measure on the trade with Ireland, was stimulated by the conquest and colonization of that island at the close of the queen's reign and the beginning of her successor's. The dream of a northern passage to India opened up a trade with a land as yet unknown. Of three ships which sailed in the reign of Mary under Hugh Willoughby to discover this passage, two were found frozen with their crews and their hapless commander on the coast of Lapland; but the third, under Richard Chancellor, made its way safely to the White sea, and by the discovery of Archangel created the trade with Russia. A more lucrative traffic had already begun with the coast of Guinea, to whose gold-dust and ivory the merchants of Southampton owed their wealth. The guilt of the slave-trade which sprang out of it rests with John Hawkins. In 1562 he returned from the African coast with a cargo of negroes; and the arms, whose grant rewarded this achievement (a demi-moor, proper, bound with a cord), commemorated his priority in the transport of slaves to the labor-fields of the New World. But the New World was already furnishing more honest sources of wealth. The voyage of Sebastian Cabot from Bristol to the mainland of North America had called English vessels to the stormy ocean of the north. From the time of Henry the Eighth the number of English boats engaged on the cod-banks of Newfoundland steadily increased, and at the close of Elizabeth's reign the seamen of Biscay found English rivals in the whale-fishery of the polar seas.

771. Elizabeth lent a ready patronage to the new commerce; she shared in its speculations, she considered its extension and protection as a part of public policy, and she sanctioned the formation of the great merchant companies which could alone secure the trader against wrong or injustice in distant countries. The merchant-adventurers of London, a body which had existed long before, and had received a charter of incorporation under Henry the Seventh, furnished a model for the Russian company and the company which absorbed the new commerce to the Indies. But it was not wholly with satisfaction that either the queen or her ministers watched the social change which wealth was producing around them. They feared the increased expenditure, and comfort which necessarily followed it, as likely to impoverish the land and to eat out the hardihood of the people. "England spendeth more on wines in one year," complained Cecil, "than it did in ancient times in four years." In the upper classes the lavishness of a new wealth combined with a lavishness of life, a love of beauty, of color, of display, to revolutionize English dress. Men "wore a manor on their backs." The queen's three thousand robes were rivaled in their bravery by the slashed velvets, the ruffs, the jeweled purpoints of the courtiers around her. But signs of the growing wealth were as evident in the lower class as in the higher. The disuse of salt fish and the greater consumption of meat marked the improvement which had taken place among the country-folk. Their rough and wattled farm-houses were being superseded by dwellings of brick and

stone. Pewter was replacing the wooden trenchers of the early yeomanry, and there were yeomen who could boast of a fair show of silver plate. It is from this period, indeed, that we can first date the rise of a conception which seems to us now a peculiarly English one, the conception of domestic comfort. The chimney-corner, so closely associated with family life, came into existence with the general introduction of chimneys, a feature rare in ordinary houses at the beginning of this reign. Pillows, which had before been despised by the farmer and the trader as fit only "for women in child-bed," were now in general use. Carpets superseded the filthy flooring of rushes. The loftier houses of the wealthier merchants, their parapeted fronts and costly wainscoting, their cumbrous but elaborate beds, their carved staircases, their quaintly figured gables, not only contrasted with the squalor which had till then characterized English towns, but marked the rise of a new middle class which was to play its part in later history.

772. A transformation of an even more striking kind marked the extinction of the feudal character of the noblesse. Gloomy walls and serried battlements disappeared from the dwellings of the gentry. The strength of the mediæval fortress gave way to the pomp and grace of the Elizabethan hall. Knoles, Longleat, Burleigh and Hatfield, Hardwick and Audley End, are familiar instances of a social as well as an architectural change which covered England with buildings where the thought of defense was abandoned for that of domestic comfort

and refinement. We still gaze with pleasure on their picturesque line of gables, their fretted fronts, their gilded turrets and fanciful vanes, their castellated gateways, the jutting oriels from which the great noble looked down on his new Italian garden, on its stately terraces and broad flights of steps, its vases and fountains, its quaint mazes, its formal walks, its lines of yews cut into grotesque shapes in hopeless rivalry of the cypress avenues of the south. Nor was the change less within than without. The life of the middle ages concentrated itself in the vast castle hall, where the baron looked from his upper dais on the retainers who gathered at his board. But the great households were fast breaking up; and the whole feudal economy disappeared when the lord of the household withdrew with his family into his "parlor" or "withdrawing-room" and left the hall to his dependents. The Italian refinement of life which told on pleasance and garden told on the remodeling of the house within, raised the principal apartments to an upper floor—a change to which we owe the grand staircases of the time—surrounded the quiet courts by long "galleries of the presence," crowned the rude hearth with huge chimney-pieces adorned with fauns and cupids, with quaintly interlaced monograms and fantastic arabesques, hung tapestries on the walls, and crowded each chamber with quaintly carved chairs and costly cabinets. The prodigal use of glass became a marked feature in the domestic architecture of the time, and one whose influence on the general health of the people can hardly be overrated. Long lines of

windows stretched over the fronts of the new manor-halls. Every merchant's house had its oriel. "You shall have sometimes," Lord Bacon grumbled, "your houses so full of glass that we cannot tell where to come to be out of the sun or the cold."

778. What Elizabeth contributed to this upgrowth of national prosperity was the peace and social order from which it sprang. While autos-da-fe were blazing at Rome and Madrid, while the Inquisition was driving the sober traders of the Netherlands to madness, while Scotland was tossing with religious strife, while the policy of Catharine secured for France but a brief respite from the horrors of civil war, England remained untroubled and at peace. Religious order was little disturbed. Recusants were few. There was little cry as yet for freedom of worship. Freedom of conscience was the right of every man. Persecution had ceased. It was only as the tale of a darker past that men recalled how ten years back heretics had been sent to the fire. Civil order was even more profound than religious order. The failure of the northern revolt proved the political tranquillity of the country. The social troubles from vagrancy and evictions were slowly passing away. Taxation was light. The country was firmly and steadily governed. The popular favor which had met Elizabeth at her accession was growing into a passionate devotion. Of her faults, indeed, England beyond the circle of her court knew little or nothing. The shiftings of her diplomacy were never seen outside the royal closet. The nation at large could only judge her foreign

policy by its main outlines, by its temperance and good sense, and, above all, by its success. But every Englishman was able to judge Elizabeth in her rule at home, in her love of peace, her instinct of order, the firmness and moderation of her government, the judicious spirit of conciliation and compromise among warring factions which gave the country an unexampled tranquillity at a time when almost every other country in Europe was torn with civil war. Every sign of the growing prosperity, the sight of London as it became the mart of the world, of stately mansions as they rose on every manor, told, and justly told, in the queen's favor. Her statue in the center of the London Exchange was a tribute on the part of the merchant class to the interest with which she watched and shared personally in its enterprises. Her thrift won a general gratitude. The memories of the terror and of the martyrs threw into bright relief the aversion from bloodshed which was conspicuous in her earlier reign, and never wholly wanting through its fiercer close. Above all there was a general confidence in her instinctive knowledge of the national temper. Her finger was always on the public pulse. She knew exactly when she could resist the feeling of her people, and when she must give way before the new sentiment of freedom which her policy unconsciously fostered. But when she retreated, her defeat had all the grace of victory; and the frankness and unreserve of her surrender won back at once the love that her resistance lost. Her attitude at home, in fact, was that of a woman whose pride in

the well-being of her subjects and whose longing for their favor was the one warm touch in the coldness of her natural temper. If Elizabeth could be said to love anything, she loved England. "Nothing," she said to her first parliament in words of unwonted fire—"nothing, no worldly thing under the sun, is so dear to me as the love and good-will of my subjects." And the love and good-will which were so dear to her she fully won.

774. It was this personal devotion that enabled Elizabeth to face the religious difficulties of her reign. Formidable as these had been from its outset, they were now growing into actual dangers. The attack of the papacy from without had deepened the tide of religious fanaticism within. For the nation at large Elizabeth's system was no doubt a wise and healthy one. Single-handed, unsupported by any of the statesmen or divines about her, the queen had forced on the warring religions a sort of armed truce. While the main principles of the reformation were accepted, the zeal of the ultra-reformers was held at bay. Outer conformity, attendance at the common prayer, was exacted from all, but changes in ritual which would have drawn attention to the change in religion were steadily resisted. The Bible was left open. Public discussion was unrestrained. On the other hand, the warfare of pulpit against pulpit was silenced by the licensing of preachers. In 1567 Elizabeth gave the Protestant zealots a rough proof that she would not suffer them to draw the Catholics into controversy and rouse the opposition to her system which controversy could not fail to

bring with it. Parker's successor, Archbishop Grindal, who had been one of the Marian exiles and returned with much of the Calvinistic fanaticism, showed favor to a "liberty of prophesying," or preaching, which would have flooded the realm with Protestant disputants. Elizabeth at once interposed. The "liberty of prophesying" was brought to an end; even the number of licensed preachers was curtailed; and the primate himself was suspended from the exercise of his functions.

775. No stronger proof could have been given of the queen's resolve to watch jealously over the religious peace of her realm. In her earlier years such a resolve went fairly with the general temper of the people at large. The mass of Englishmen remained true in sentiment to the older creed. But they conformed to the new worship. They shrank from any open defiance of the government. They shrank from reawakening the fierce strife of religions, of calling back the horsemen of Somerset or the fires of Mary. They saw little doctrinal difference between the new prayer and the old. Above all they trusted to patience. They had seen too many religious revolutions to believe that any revolution would be lasting. They believed that the changes would be undone again as they had been undone before. They held that Elizabeth was only acting under pressure, and that her real inclination was toward the old religion. They trusted in Philip's influence, in an Austrian marriage, in the queen's dread of a breach with the papacy, in the pressure of Mary Stuart. And meanwhile the years

went by, and as the memories of the past became dimmer, and custom laid a heavier and heavier hand on the mass of men, and a new generation grew up that had never known the spell of Catholicism, the nation drifted from its older tradition and became Protestant in its own despite.

776. It was no doubt a sense that the religious truce was doing their work, as well as a dread of alienating the queen and throwing her into the hands of their opponents by a more violent pressure, which brought the more zealous reformers to acquiesce through Elizabeth's earlier years in this system of compromise. But it was no sooner denounced by the papacy than it was attacked by the Puritans. The rebellion of the northern earls, the withdrawal from the public worship, the bull of deposition, roused a fanatical zeal among the Calvinistic party which predominated in the parliament of 1571. The movement in favor of a more pronounced Protestantism, of a more utter break with the Catholic past, which had slowly spread from the knot of exiles who returned to Geneva, now gathered a new strength; and a bill was brought in for the reform of the Book of Common Prayer by the omission of the practices which displeased the Genevan party among the clergy. A yet closer approach to the theocratic system of Calvin was seen when the lower house refused its assent to a statute that would have bound the clergy to subscribe to those articles which recognized the royal supremacy, the power of the church to ordain rites and ceremonies, and the actual form of church government. At such a

crisis even the weightiest statesmen at Elizabeth's council board believed that in the contest with Rome the crown would have to rely on Protestant zeal, and the influence of Cecil and Walsingham backed the pressure of the parliament. But the queen was only stirred to a burst of anger; she ordered Strickland, who had introduced the bill for liturgical reform, to appear no more in parliament, and, though she withdrew the order as soon as she perceived the house was bent on his restoration, she would hear nothing of the changes on which the commons were set.

777. Her resistance showed the sagacity with which the queen caught the general temper of her people. The Catholic pressure had made it needful to exclude Catholics from the commons and from the council-board, but a Protestant council and a Protestant parliament were by no means fair representatives of the general drift of English opinion. Her religious indifference left Elizabeth a better judge of the timid and hesitating advance of religious sentiment, of the stubborn clinging to the past, of the fear of change, of the dread of revolution, which made the winning of the people as a whole to the reformation a slow and tedious process. The Protestants were increasing in number, but they were still a minority of the nation. The zealous Catholics, who withdrew from church at the pope's bidding, were a still smaller minority. The bulk of Englishmen were striving to cling to their religious prejudice and to loyalty as well, to obey their conscience and their queen at once, and in such a tem-

per of men's minds any sudden and decisive change would have fallen like a thunderbolt. Elizabeth had no will to follow in the track of Rome, and to help the pope to drive every waverer into action. Weakened and broken as it was, she clung obstinately to her system of compromise; and the general opinion gave her a strength which enabled her to resist the pressure of her council and her parliament. So difficult, however, was her position that a change might have been forced on her had she not been aided at this moment by a group of clerical bigots who gathered under the banner of Presbyterianism.

778. Of these, Thomas Cartwright was the chief. He had studied at Geneva; he returned with a fanatical faith in Calvinism, and in the system of church government which Calvin had devised; and as Margaret professor of divinity at Cambridge he used to the full the opportunities which his chair gave him of propagating his opinions. No leader of a religious party ever deserved less of after sympathy. Cartwright was unquestionably learned and devout, but his bigotry was that of a mediæval inquisitor. The relics of the old ritual, the cross in baptism, the surplice, the giving of a ring in marriage, were to him not merely distasteful, as they were to the Puritans at large, they were idolatrous and the mark of the beast. His declamation against ceremonies and superstition, however, had little weight with Elizabeth or her primates; what scared them was his reckless advocacy of a scheme of ecclesiastical government which placed the state beneath the feet of the church. The absolute rule of

bishops, indeed, Cartwright denounced as begotten of the devil; but the absolute rule of presbyters he held to be established by the word of God. For the church modeled after the fashion of Geneva he claimed an authority which surpassed the wildest dreams of the masters of the Vatican. All spiritual authority and jurisdiction, the decreeing of doctrine, the ordering of ceremonies, lay wholly in the hands of the ministers of the church. To them belonged the supervision of public morals. In an ordered arrangement of classes and synods, these presbyters were to govern their flocks, to regulate their own order, to decide in matters of faith, to administer "discipline." Their weapon was excommunication, and they were responsible for its use to none but Christ. The province of the civil ruler in such a system of religion as this was simply to carry out the decisions of the presbyters, "to see their decrees executed and to punish the contemners of them." Nor was this work of the civil power likely to be a light work. The spirit of Calvinistic Presbyterianism excluded all toleration of practice or belief. Not only was the rule of ministers to be established as the one legal form of church government, but all other forms, Episcopalian and separatist, were to be ruthlessly put down. For heresy there was the punishment of death. Never had the doctrine of persecution been urged with such a blind and reckless ferocity. "I deny," wrote Cartwright, "that upon repentance there ought to follow any pardon of death. . . . Heretics ought to be put to death now. If this be bloody and extreme, I am

content to be so counted with the Holy Ghost." The violence of language such as this was as unlikely as the dogmatism of his theological teaching to commend Cartwright's opinions to the mass of Englishmen. Popular as the Presbyterian system became in Scotland, it never took any popular hold on England. It remained to the last a clerical rather than a national creed, and even in the moment of its seeming triumph under the commonwealth it was rejected by every part of England save London and Lancashire. But the bold challenge which Cartwright's party delivered to the government in 1572, in an "admonition to the parliament," which denounced the government of bishops as contrary to the word of God, and demanded the establishment in its place of government by presbyters, raised a panic among English statesmen and prelates which cut off all hopes of a quiet treatment of the merely ceremonial questions which really troubled the consciences of the more advanced Protestants. The natural progress of opinion abruptly ceased, and the moderate thinkers who had pressed for a change in ritual which would have satisfied the zeal of the reformers withdrew from union with a party which revived the worst pretensions of the papacy.

779. But the eyes of Elizabeth as of her subjects were drawn from difficulties at home to the conflict which took fresh fire over sea. In Europe, as in England, the tide of religious passion which had so long been held in check was now breaking over the banks which restrained it; and with this outbreak of forces, before which the diplomacy and intrigues of

its statesmen fell powerless, the political face of Europe was changed. In 1572 the power of the King of Spain had reached its height. The Netherlands were at his feet. In the east his trouble from the pressure of the Turks seemed brought to an end by a brilliant victory at Lepanto, in which his fleet with those of Venice and the pope annihilated the fleet of the sultan. He could throw his whole weight upon the Calvinism of the west, and above all upon France, where the Guises were fast sinking into mere partisans of Spain. The common danger drew France and England together; and Catharine of Medicis strove to bind the two countries in one political action by offering to Elizabeth the hand of her son Henry, the Duke of Anjou. But at this moment of danger, the whole situation was changed by the rising of the Netherlands. Driven to despair by the greed and persecution of Alva, the Low Countries rose in a revolt which after strange alternations of fortune gave to the world the republic of the United Provinces. Of the Protestants driven out by the duke's cruelties, many had taken to the seas and cruised as pirates in the channel, making war on Spanish vessels under the flag of the Prince of Orange. Like the Huguenot privateers who had sailed under Condé's flag, these freebooters found shelter in the English ports. But in the spring of 1572, Alva demanded their expulsion; and Elizabeth, unable to resist, sent them orders to put to sea. The duke's success proved fatal to his master's cause. The "water-beggars," a little band of some two hundred and fifty men, were driven by stress of

weather into the Meuse. There they seized the city of Brill, and repulsed a Spanish force which strove to recapture it. The repulse was the signal for a general rising. All the great cities of Holland and Zealand drove out their garrisons. The northern provinces of Gelderland, Overijssel, and Friesland followed their example, and by the summer half of the Low Countries were in revolt.

780. A yet greater danger threatened Alva in the south, where Mons had been surprised by Lewis of Nassau, and where the Calvinists were crying for support from the Huguenots of France. The opening which their rising afforded was seized by the Huguenot leaders as a political engine to break the power which Catharine of Medicis exercised over Charles the Ninth, and to set aside her policy of religious balance by placing France at the head of Protestantism in the west. Weak and passionate in temper, jealous of the warlike fame which his brother, the Duke of Anjou, had won at Montcontour, dreading above all the power of Spain and eager to grasp the opportunity of breaking it by a seizure of the Netherlands, Charles listened to the counsels of Coligni, who pressed for war upon Philip and promised the support of the Huguenots in an invasion of the Low Countries. Never had a fairer prospect opened to French ambition. But Catharine had no mind to be set aside. To her cool political temper the supremacy of the Huguenots seemed as fatal to the crown as the supremacy of the Catholics. A triumph of Calvinism in the Netherlands, wrought out by the swords of the French Calvinists, would

decide not only the religious but the political destinies of France; and Catharine saw ruin for the monarchy in a France at once Protestant and free. She suddenly united with the Guises and suffered them to rouse the fanatical mob of Paris, while she won back the king by picturing the royal power as about to pass into the hands of Coligni. On the 24th of August, St. Bartholomew's day, the plot broke out in an awful massacre. At Paris the populace murdered Coligni and almost all the Huguenot leaders. A hundred thousand Protestants fell as the fury spread from town to town. In that awful hour Philip and Catholicism were saved. The Spanish king laughed for joy. The new pope, Gregory the Thirteenth, ordered a Te Deum to be sung. Instead of conquering the Netherlands France plunged madly back into a chaos of civil war, and the Low Countries were left to cope single-handed with the armies of Spain.

781. They could look for no help from Elizabeth. Whatever enthusiasm the heroic struggle of the Prince of Orange for their liberties excited among her subjects, it failed to move Elizabeth even for an instant from the path of cold self-interest. To her the revolt of the Netherlands was simply "a bridle of Spain, which kept war out of our own gate." At the darkest moment of the contest, when Alva had won back all but Holland and Zealand and even William of Orange despaired, the queen bent her energies to prevent him from finding succor in France. That the Low Countries could in the end withstand Philip neither she nor any English states-

men believed. They held that the struggle must close either in their subjection to him, or in their selling themselves for aid to France; and the accession of power which either result must give to one of her two Catholic foes the queen was eager to avert. Her plan for averting it was by forcing the provinces to accept the terms which were now offered by Alva's successor, Requesens, a restoration of their constitutional privileges on condition of their submission to the church. Peace on such a footing would not only restore English commerce, which suffered from the war; it would leave the Netherlands still formidable as a weapon against Philip. The freedom of the provinces would be saved; and the religious question involved in a fresh submission to the yoke of Catholicism was one which Elizabeth was incapable of appreciating. To her the steady refusal of William the Silent to sacrifice his faith was as unintelligible as the steady bigotry of Philip in demanding such a sacrifice. It was of more immediate consequence that Philip's anxiety to avoid provoking an intervention on the part of England left Elizabeth tranquil at home. The policy of Requesens after Alva's departure at the close of 1578 was a policy of pacification; and with the steady resistance of the Netherlands still foiling his efforts Philip saw that his one hope of success rested on the avoidance of intervention from without. The civil war which followed the massacre of St. Bartholomew removed all danger of such an intervention on the side of France. A weariness of religious strife enabled Catharine again to return to

her policy of toleration in the summer of 1578; but though the death of Charles the Ninth and accession of his brother Henry the Third in the following year left the queen-mother's power unbroken, the balance she preserved was too delicate to leave room for any schemes without the realm.

782. English intervention it was yet more needful to avoid; and the hopes of an attack upon England which Rome had drawn from Philip's fanaticism were thus utterly blasted. To the fiery exhortations of Gregory the Thirteenth the king only answered by counsels of delay. But Rome could not delay her efforts. All her hopes of recovering England lay in the Catholic sympathies of the mass of Englishmen, and every year that went by weakened her chance of victory. The firm refusal of Elizabeth to suffer the Puritans to break in with any violent changes on her ecclesiastical policy was justified by its slow but steady success. Silently, almost unconsciously, England became Protestant as the traditional Catholicism which formed the religion of three-fourths of the people at the queen's accession died quietly away. At the close of her reign the only parts of England where the old faith retained anything of its former vigor were the north and the extreme west, at that time the poorest and least populated parts of the kingdom. One main cause of the change lay in the gradual dying out or removal of the Catholic priesthood and the growth of a new Protestant clergy who supplied their place. The older parish priests, though they had almost to a man acquiesced in the changes of ritual and doctrine

which the various phases of the reformation imposed upon them, remained in heart utterly hostile to its spirit. As Mary had undone the changes of Edward, they hoped for a Catholic successor to undo the changes of Elizabeth; and in the mean time they were content to wear the surplice instead of the chasuble, and to use the communion office instead of the mass-book. But, if they were forced to read the homilies from the pulpit, the spirit of their teaching remained unchanged; and it was easy for them to cast contempt on the new services till they seemed to old-fashioned worshipers a mere "Christmas game." But the lapse of years did its work in emptying parsonage after parsonage. In 1579 the queen felt strong enough to enforce for the first time a general compliance with the act of uniformity; and the jealous supervision of Parker and the bishops insured an inner as well as an outer conformity to the established faith in the clergy who took the place of the dying priesthood. The new parsons were, for the most part, not merely Protestant in belief and teaching, but ultra-Protestant. The old restrictions on the use of the pulpit were silently removed as the need for them passed away, and the zeal of the young ministers showed itself in an assiduous preaching which molded in their own fashion the religious ideas of the new generation. But their character had even a greater influence than their preaching. Under Henry the priests had, in large part, been ignorant and sensual men; and the character of the clergy appointed by the greedy Protestants under Edward or at the opening of

Elizabeth's reign was even worse than that of their Catholic rivals. But the energy of the successive primates, seconded as it was by the general increase of zeal and morality at the time, did its work; and by the close of the queen's reign the moral temper as well as the social character of the clergy had greatly changed. Scholars like Hooker could now be found in the ranks of the priesthood, and the grosser scandals which disgraced the clergy as a body for the most part disappeared. It was impossible for a Puritan libeler to bring against the ministers of Elizabeth's reign the charges of drunkenness and immorality which Protestant libelers had been able to bring against the priesthood of Henry's.

783. But the influence of the new clergy was backed by a general revolution in English thought. The grammar-schools were diffusing a new knowledge and mental energy through the middle classes and among the country gentry. The tone of the universities, no unfair test of the tone of the nation at large, changed wholly as the queen's reign went on. At its opening Oxford was "a nest of papists," and sent its best scholars to feed the Catholic seminaries. At its close the university was a hot-bed of Puritanism, where the fiercest tenets of Calvin reigned supreme. The movement was no doubt hastened by the political circumstances of the time. Under the rule of Elizabeth, loyalty became more and more a passion among Englishmen; and the bull of deposition placed Rome in the forefront of Elizabeth's foes. The conspiracies which festered around Mary were laid to the pope's charge; he was known

to be pressing on France and on Spain the invasion and conquest of the heretic kingdom; he was soon to bless the Armada. Every day made it harder for a Catholic to reconcile Catholicism with loyalty to his queen or devotion to his country; and the mass of men, who are moved by a sentiment rather than by reason, swung slowly round to the side which, whatever its religious significance might be, was the side of patriotism, of liberty against tyranny, of England against Spain. A new impulse was given to this silent drift of religious opinion by the atrocities which marked the Catholic triumph on the other side of the channel. The horror of Alva's butcheries or of the massacre in Paris on St. Bartholomew's day revived the memories of the blood shed under Mary. The tale of Protestant sufferings was told with a wonderful pathos and picturesqueness by John Foxe, an exile during the persecution; and his "Book of Martyrs," which was set up by royal order in the churches for public reading, passed from the churches to the shelves of every English household. The trading classes of the towns had been the first to embrace the doctrines of the reformation, but their Protestantism became a passion as the refugees of the continent brought to shop and market their tale of outrage and blood. Thousands of Flemish exiles found a refuge in the Cinque Ports, a third of the Antwerp merchants were seen pacing the new London Exchange, and a church of French Huguenots found a home which it still retains in the crypt of Canterbury cathedral.

784. But the decay of Catholicism appealed

strongly to the new spirit of Catholic zeal, which, in its despair of aid from Catholic princes, was girding itself for its own bitter struggle with heresy. Pius the Fifth had now passed away, but the policy of the papal court remained unchanged. His successor, Gregory the Thirteenth, showed the same restless zeal, the same world-wide energy, in the work of winning back the nations to the Catholic church. Rome was still the center of the Catholic crusade. It wielded material as well as spiritual arms. If the papacy had ceased to be a military power, it remained a financial power. Taxes were multiplied, expenses reduced, estates confiscated, free towns reduced to servitude, with the one aim of enabling Gregory and his successors to build up a vast system of loans which poured the wealth of Europe into the treasury of Catholicism. It was the treasure of the Vatican which financed the Catholic movement. Subsidies from the papacy fitted out the fleet that faced the Turk at Lepanto, and gathered round the Guises their lance-knights from the Rhine. Papal supplies equipped expeditions against Ireland, and helped Philip to bear the cost of the Armada. It was the papal exchequer which supported the world-wide diplomacy that was carrying on negotiations in Sweden and intrigues in Poland, goading the lukewarm emperor to action or quickening the sluggish movements of Spain, plotting the ruin of Geneva or the assassination of Orange, stirring up revolt in England and civil war in France. It was the papacy that bore the cost of the religious propaganda that was fighting its stubborn battle with Calvinist and

Lutheran on the Rhine and the Elbe, or sending its missionaries to win back the lost isle of the west. As early as 1568 Dr. Allen, a scholar who had been driven from Oxford by the test prescribed in the act of uniformity, had foreseen the results of the dying out of the Marian priests, and had set up a seminary at Douay to supply their place. The new college was liberally supported by the Catholic peers, and supplied with pupils by a stream of refugees from Oxford and the English grammar-schools. Three years after its opening, the college numbered a hundred and fifty members. It was in these "seminary priests" that Gregory the Thirteenth saw the means of reviving Catholic zeal in England, and at the pope's bidding they began in 1576 to pass over to English shores.

785. Few as the new-comers were at first, their presence was at once felt in the check which it gave to the gradual reconciliation of the Catholic gentry to the English church. No check could have been more galling to Elizabeth, and her resentment was quickened by the sense of danger. Rome had set itself in the forefront of her foes. She had accepted the issue of the bull of deposition as a declaration of war on the part of the papacy, and she viewed the Douay priests, with some justice, as its political emissaries. The comparative security of the Catholics from active persecution during the early part of her reign had arisen partly from the sympathy and connivance of the gentry who acted as justices of the peace, and still more from her own religious indifference. But the test act placed the magistracy in

Protestant hands; and as Elizabeth passed from indifference to suspicion and from suspicion to terror she put less restraint on the bigotry around her. In quitting Eaton hall, which she had visited in one of her pilgrimages, the queen gave its master, young Rookwood, thanks for his entertainment and her hand to kiss. "But my lord chamberlain, nobly and gravely understanding that Rookwood was excommunicate" for non-attendance at church, "called him before him, demanded of him how he durst presume to attempt her royal presence, he unfit to accompany any Christian person, forthwith said that he was fitter for a pair of stocks, commanded him out of court, and yet to attend the council's pleasure." The council's pleasure was seen in his committal to the town prison at Norwich, while "seven more gentlemen of worship" were fortunate enough to escape with a simple sentence of arrest at their own homes. The queen's terror became a panic in the nation at large. The few priests who landed from Douay were multiplied into an army of papal emissaries dispatched to sow treason and revolt throughout the land. Parliament, which the working of the test act had made a wholly Protestant body, save for the presence of a few Catholics among the peers, was summoned to meet the new danger, and declared by formal statute the landing of these priests and the harboring of them to be treason. The act proved no idle menace; and the execution of Cuthbert Mayne, a young priest who was arrested in Cornwall with the papal bull of deposition hidden about him, gave a terrible indication of the character of

the struggle upon which Elizabeth was about to enter.

786. The execution of Cuthbert Mayne was far from being purposed as the opening of a religious persecution. To modern eyes there is something even more revolting than open persecution in a policy which branded every Catholic priest as a traitor and all Catholic worship as disloyalty; but the first step toward toleration was won when the queen rested her system of repression on purely political grounds. If Elizabeth was a persecutor, she was the first English ruler who felt the charge of religious persecution to be a stigma on her rule. Nor can it be denied that there was a real political danger in the new missionaries. Allen was a restless conspirator, and the work of his seminary priests was meant to aid a new plan of the papacy for the conquest of England. In 1576, on the death of Requesens, the Spanish governor of the Low Countries, a successor was found for him in Don John of Austria, a natural brother of Philip, the victor of Lepanto, and the most famous general of his day. The temper of Don John was daring and ambitious; his aim was a crown; and he sought in the Netherlands the means of winning one. His ambition lent itself easily to the schemes of Mary Stuart and of Rome; and he resolved to bring about by quick concessions a settlement in the Low Countries, to cross with the Spanish forces employed there to England, to raise the Catholics in revolt, to free and marry Mary Stuart, and reign in her right as an English king. The plan was an able one; but it was foiled

ere he reached his post. The Spanish troops had mutinied on the death of Requesens; and their sack of Antwerp drew the states of the Netherlands together in a "pacification of Ghent." All differences of religion were set aside in a common purpose to drive out the stranger. Baffled as he was, the subtlety of Don John turned even this league to account. Their demand for the withdrawal of the Spanish troops, though fatal to Philip's interests in the Low Countries, could be made to serve the interests of Don John across the seas. In February, 1577, therefore, he ratified the pacification of Ghent, consented to the maintenance of the liberties of the states, and engaged to withdraw the army. He stipulated only for its withdrawal by sea, and for a delay of three months, which was needful for the arrangement of his descent on the English coast. Both demands, however, were refused; he was forced to withdraw his troops at once and by land, and the scheme of the papacy found itself utterly foiled.

787. Secret as were the plans of Don John, Elizabeth had seen how near danger had drawn to her. Fortune again proved her friend, for the efforts of Don John to bring about a reconciliation of the Netherlands proved fruitless, and negotiations soon passed again into the clash of arms. But the queen was warned at last. On the new outbreak of war in 1577 she allied herself with the states, and sent them money and men. Such a step, though not in form an act of hostility against Philip—for the provinces with which she leagued herself still owned themselves as Philip's subjects—was a measure which

proved the queen's sense of her need of the Netherlands. Though she had little sympathy with their effort for freedom, she saw in them "the one bridle to Spain to keep war out of our own gate." But she was to see the war drift nearer and nearer to her shores. Now that the Netherlands were all but lost, Philip's slow, stubborn temper strung itself to meet the greatness of the peril. The Spanish army was reinforced; and in January, 1578, it routed the army of the states on the field of Gemblours. The sickness and death of Don John arrested its progress for a few months; but his successor, Philip's nephew, Alexander Farnese, the Prince of Parma, soon proved his greatness, whether as a statesman or a general. He seized on the difference of faith between the Catholic and Protestant states as a means of division. The pacification of Ghent was broken at the opening of 1579 by the secession of the Walloon provinces of the southern border. It was only by a new league of the seven northern provinces where Protestantism was dominant in the Union of Utrecht that William of Orange could meet Parma's stroke. But the general union of the Low Countries was fatally broken, and from this moment the ten Catholic states passed one by one into the hands of Spain.

788. The new vigor of Philip in the west marked a change in the whole policy of Spain. Till now, in spite of endless provocations, Philip had clung to the English alliance. Fear of Elizabeth's union with France, dread of her help to the Netherlands, had steeled him to bear patiently her defiance of his

counsels, her neglect of his threats, her seizure of his treasure, her persecution of the Catholic party which looked to him as its head. But patience had only been met by fresh attacks. The attempt of Don John had spurred Elizabeth to ally herself to France. She was expected every hour to marry the Duke of Anjou. She had given friendship and aid to the revolted provinces. Above all, her freebooters were carrying war into the far Pacific, and challenging the right of Spain to the new world of the west. Philip drifted whether he would or no into a position of hostility. He had not forbidden the projects of Don John; he at last promised aid to the projects of Rome. In 1579 the papacy planned the greatest and most comprehensive of its attacks upon Elizabeth. If the Catholic powers still hesitated and delayed, Rome was resolute to try its own strength in the west. The spiritual reconciliation of England was not enough. However successful the efforts of the seminary priests might prove, they would leave Elizabeth on the throne, and the reign of Elizabeth was a defeat to the papacy. In issuing its bull of deposition, Rome had staked all on the ruin of the queen, and, even if England became Catholic, Gregory could not suffer his spiritual subjects to obey a ruler whom his sentence had declared an unlawful possessor of the throne. And now that the temper of Spain promised more vigorous action, Rome could pave the way for a landing of Philip's troops by stirring up a threefold danger for Elizabeth. While fresh and more vigorous missionaries egged on the English Catholics to revolt, the pope

hastened to bring about a Catholic revolution in Scotland and a Catholic insurrection in Ireland.

789. In Ireland, Sidney's victory had been followed by ten years of peace. Had the land been left to itself there would have been nothing more than the common feuds and disturbances of the time. The policy of driving its people to despair by seizing their lands for English settlements had been abandoned since Mary's day. The religious question had hardly any practical existence. On the queen's accession, indeed, the ecclesiastical policy of the Protestants had been revived in name; Rome was again renounced; the act of uniformity forced on the island the use of the English prayer-book, and compelled attendances at the services where it was used. There was, as before, a general air of compliance with the law. Even in the districts without the pale, the bishops generally conformed; and the only exceptions of which we have any information were to be found in the extreme south and in the north, where resistance was distant enough to be safe. But the real cause of this apparent submission to the act of uniformity lay in the fact that it remained, and necessarily remained, a dead letter. It was impossible to find any considerable number of Irish ministers or of Irish priests acquainted with English. Meath was one of the most civilized dioceses of the island, and out of a hundred curates in it hardly ten knew any tongue save their own. The promise that the service-book should be translated into Irish was never carried out, and the final clause of the act itself authorized the use of a Latin rendering of it

till further order could be taken. But this, like its other provisions, was ignored; and throughout Elizabeth's reign the gentry of the pale went unquestioned to mass. There was, in fact, no religious persecution, and in the many complaints of Shane O'Neill we find no mention of a religious grievance.

790. But this was far from being the view of Rome or of Spain, of the Catholic missionaries, or of the Irish exiles abroad. They represented, and perhaps believed, the Irish people to be writhing under a religious oppression which it was burning to shake off. They saw in the Irish loyalty to Catholicism a lever for overthrowing the heretic queen. Stukely, an Irish refugee, had pressed on the pope and Spain, as early as 1571, the policy of a descent on Ireland; and though a force gathered in 1578 by the pope for this purpose was diverted to a mad crusade against the Moors, his plans were carried out in 1579 by the landing of a small force under the brother of the Earl of Desmond, James Fitzmaurice, on the coast of Kerry. The Irish, however, held aloof, and Fitzmaurice fell in a skirmish; but the revolt of the Earl of Desmond gave fresh hope of success, and the rising was backed by the arrival, in 1580, of 2,000 papal soldiers "in five great ships." These mercenaries were headed by an Italian captain, San Giuseppe, and accompanied by a papal legate, the Jesuit Sanders, who brought plenary indulgence for all who joined the sacred enterprise, and threats of damnation for all who resisted it. "What will you answer to the pope's treatment," ran his letter to the Irish, "when he, bringing us

the pope's and other Catholic princes' aid, shall charge you with the crime and pain of heretics for maintaining an heretical pretended queen against the public sentence of Christ's vicar? Can she, with her feigned supremacy, absolve and acquit you from the pope's excommunication and curse?" The news of the landing of this force stirred in England a Protestant frenzy that foiled the scheme for a Catholic marriage with the Duke of Anjou; while Elizabeth, panic-stricken, urged the French king to save her from Philip by an invasion of the Netherlands. But the danger passed quickly away. The papal attempt ended in a miserable failure. The fort of Smerwick, in which the invaders intrenched themselves, was forced to surrender and its garrison put ruthlessly to the sword. The Earl of Desmond, who, after long indecision, rose to support them, was defeated and hunted over his own country, which the panic-born cruelty of his pursuers harried into a wilderness.

791. Pitiless as it was, the work done in Munster spread a terror over Ireland which served England in good stead when the struggle of Catholicism culminated in the fight with the Armada; and not a chieftain stirred during that memorable year save to massacre the miserable men who were shipwrecked along the coast of Bantry or Sligo. But the Irish revolt did much to give fresh strength to the panic which the efforts of the seminary priests had roused in England. This was raised to frenzy by news that to the effort of the seminary priests were now added those of Jesuit missionaries. Pope Gregory

had resolved to support his military effort in Ireland by a fresh missionary effort in England itself. Philip would only promise to invade England if the co-operation of its Catholics was secured; and the aim of the new mission was to prepare them for revolt. While the force of San Giuseppe was being equipped for Kerry, a young convert, William Gilbert, was dispatched to form a Catholic association in England; among whose members the chief were hereafter found engaged in conspiracies for the death of Elizabeth or sharing in the gunpowder plot. As soon as this was organized as many as fifty priests, if we may trust Allen's statement, were sent to land secretly on the coast. They were headed by two men of remarkable talents and energy. A large number of the Oxford refugees at Douay had joined the Order of Jesus, whose members were already famous for their blind devotion to the will and judgments of Rome; and the two ablest and most eloquent of these exiles, Campian, once a fellow of St. John's, and Parsons, once a fellow of Balliol, were dispatched in the spring of 1580 as the heads of a Jesuit mission in England. Their special aim was to win the nobility and gentry to the church, and for the moment their success seemed overwhelming. "It is supposed," wrote Allen triumphantly, "that there are 20,000 more Catholics this year than last." The eagerness shown to hear Campian was so great that, in spite of the rewards offered for his arrest by the government, he was able to preach with hardly a show of concealment to a large audience at Smithfield. From London the Jesuits wandered in the

disguise of captains or serving-men, sometimes even in the cassocks of the English clergy, through many of the counties; and wherever they went the zeal of the Catholic gentry revived. The list of nobles won back to the older faith by these wandering apostles was headed by the name of Lord Oxford, Cecil's own son-in-law, and the proudest among English peers.

792. Their success in undoing the queen's work of compromise was shown in a more public way by the growing withdrawal of the Catholics from attendance at the worship of the English church. It was plain that a fierce religious struggle was at hand, and men felt that behind this lay a yet fiercer political struggle. Philip's hosts were looming over sea, and the horrors of foreign invasion seemed about to be added to the horrors of civil war. The panic of the Protestants and of the parliament outran even the real greatness of the danger. The little group of missionaries was magnified by popular fancy into a host of disguised Jesuits; and the invasion of this imaginary host was met by the seizure and torture of as many priests as the government could lay hands on, the imprisonment of recusants, the securing of the prominent Catholics throughout the country, and by the assembling of parliament at the opening of 1581. An act "to retain the queen's majesty's subjects in due obedience" prohibited the saying of mass even in private houses, increased the fine on recusants to twenty pounds a month, and enacted that "all persons pretending to any power of absolving subjects from their allegiance, or practicing to withdraw

them to the Romish religion, with all persons after the present session willingly so absolved or reconciled to the see of Rome, shall be guilty of high treason." The way in which the vast powers conferred on the crown by this statute were used by Elizabeth was not only characteristic in itself, but important as at once defining the policy to which, in theory at least, her successors adhered for more than a hundred years. No layman was brought to the bar or to the block under its provisions. The oppression of the Catholic gentry was limited to an exaction, more or less rigorous at different times, of the fines for recusancy or non-attendance at public worship. The work of bloodshed was reserved wholly for priests, and under Elizabeth this work was done with a ruthless energy which for the moment crushed the Catholic reaction. The Jesuits were tracked by pursuivants and spies, dragged from their hiding-places, and sent in batches to the Tower. So hot was the pursuit that Parsons was forced to fly across the channel; while Campian was arrested in July, 1581, brought a prisoner through the streets of London amid the howling of the mob, and placed at the bar on the charge of treason. "Our religion only is our crime," was a plea which galled his judges; but the political danger of the Jesuit preaching was disclosed in his evasion of any direct reply when questioned as to his belief in the validity of the excommunication or deposition of the queen by the papal see, and after much hesitation he was executed as a traitor.

793. Rome was now at open war with England. Even the more conservative Englishmen looked on papacy as the first among England's foes. In striving to enforce the claims of its temporal supremacy, Rome had roused against it that national pride which had battled with it even in the middle ages. From that hour, therefore, the cause of Catholicism was lost. England became Protestant in heart and soul when Protestantism became identified with patriotism. But it was not to Protestantism only that this attitude of Rome and the policy it forced on the government gave a new impulse. The death of Campian was the prelude to a steady, pitiless effort at the extermination of his class. If we adopt the Catholic estimate of the time, the twenty years which followed saw the execution of 200 priests, while a yet greater number perished in the filthy and fever-stricken jails into which they were plunged. The work of reconciliation to Rome was arrested by this ruthless energy; but, on the other hand, the work which the priests had effected could not be undone. The system of quiet compulsion and conciliation to which Elizabeth had trusted for the religious reunion of her subjects was foiled; and the English Catholics, fined, imprisoned at every crisis of national danger, and deprived of their teachers by the prison and the gibbet, were severed more hopelessly than ever from the national church. A fresh impulse was thus given to the growing current of opinion which was to bring England at last to recognize the right of every man to freedom both of conscience and of worship. "In Henry's days, the

father of this Elizabeth," wrote a Catholic priest at this time, "the whole kingdom, with all its bishops and learned men, abjured their faith at one word of the tyrant. But now in his daughter's days, boys and women boldly profess the faith before the judge, and refuse to make the slightest concession even at the threat of death." What Protestantism had first done under Mary, Catholicism was doing under Elizabeth. It was deepening the sense of personal religion. It was revealing in men who had till now cowered before the might of kinship a power greater than the might of kings. It was breaking the spell which the monarchy had laid on the imagination of the people. The crown ceased to seem irresistible when "boys and women" dared to resist it; it lost its mysterious sacredness when half the nation looked on their sovereign as a heretic. The "divinity that doth hedge a king" was rudely broken in upon when Jesuit libelers were able to brand the wearer of the crown not only as a usurper but as a profligate and abandoned woman. The mighty impulse of patriotism, of national pride, which rallied the whole people round Elizabeth as the Armada threatened England or Drake threatened Spain, shielded, indeed, Elizabeth from much of the natural results of this drift of opinion. But with her death the new sentiment started suddenly to the front. The divine right of kings, the divine right of bishops, found themselves face to face with a passion for religious and political liberty which had gained vigor from the dungeon of the Catholic priest as from that of the Protestant zealot.

## CHAPTER VI.

## ENGLAND AND SPAIN.

1582—1598.

794. THE work of the Jesuits, the withdrawal of the Catholics from the churches, the panic of the Protestants, were signs that the control of events was passing from the hands of statesmen and diplomats. The long period of suspense which Elizabeth's policy had won was ending in the clash of national and political passions. The rising fanaticism of the Catholic world was breaking down the caution and hesitation of Philip, while England was setting aside the balanced neutrality of her queen and pushing boldly forward to a contest which it felt to be inevitable. The public opinion, to which Elizabeth was so sensitive, took every day a bolder and more decided tone. Her cold indifference to the heroic struggle in Flanders was more than compensated by the enthusiasm it roused among the nation at large. The earlier Flemish refugees found a home in the Cinque Ports. The exiled merchants of Antwerp were welcomed by the merchants of London. While Elizabeth dribbled out her secret aid to the Prince of Orange, the London traders sent him half a million from their own purses, a sum equal to a year's revenue of the crown. Volunteers stole across the channel in increasing numbers to the aid of the Dutch, till the five hundred Englishmen who fought in the beginning of the struggle rose to a brigade of five

thousand, whose bravery turned one of the most critical battles of the war. Dutch privateers found shelter in English ports, and English vessels hoisted the flag of the states for a dash at the Spanish traders. Protestant fervor rose steadily among Englishmen as "the best captains and soldiers" returned from the campaigns in the Low Countries to tell of Alva's atrocities, or as privateers brought back tales of English seamen who had been seized in Spain and the New World, to linger amidst the tortures of the Inquisition or to die in its fires. In the presence of this steady drift of popular passion the diplomacy of Elizabeth became of little moment. If the queen was resolute for peace, England was resolute for war. A new daring had arisen since the beginning of her reign, when Cecil and Elizabeth stood alone in their belief in England's strength, and when the diplomats of Europe regarded her obstinate defiance of Philip's counsels as "madness." The whole English people had caught the self-confidence and daring of their queen.

795. It was the instinct of liberty as well as of Protestantism that drove England forward to a conflict with Philip of Spain. Spain was at this moment the mightiest of European powers. The discoveries of Columbus had given it the New World of the west; the conquests of Cortes and Pizarro poured into its treasury the plunder of Mexico and Peru; its galleons brought the rich produce of the Indies, their gold, their jewels, their ingots of silver, to the harbor of Cadiz. To the New World the Spanish king added the fairest and wealthiest portions of the Old; he

was master of Naples and Milan, the richest and most fertile districts of Italy; in spite of revolt he was still lord of the busy provinces of the Low Countries, of Flanders, the great manufacturing district of the time, and of Antwerp, which had become the central mart for the commerce of the world. His native kingdom, poor as it was, supplied him with the steadiest and the most daring soldiers that Europe had seen since the fall of the Roman empire. The renown of the Spanish infantry had been growing from the day when it flung off the onset of the French chivalry on the field of Ravenna; and the Spanish generals stood without rivals in their military skill, as they stood without rivals in their ruthless cruelty.

796. The whole, too, of this enormous power was massed in the hands of a single man. Served as he was by able statesmen and subtle diplomatists, Philip of Spain was his own sole minister; laboring day after day, like a clerk, through the long years of his reign, amid the papers which crowded his closet; but resolute to let nothing pass without his supervision, and to suffer nothing to be done save by his express command. His scheme of rule differed widely from that of his father. Charles had held the vast mass of his dominions by a purely personal bond. He chose no capital, but moved ceaselessly from land to land; he was German in the empire, a Spaniard in Castile, a Netherlander in the Netherlands. But in the hands of Philip, his father's heritage became a Spanish realm. His capital was fixed at Madrid. The rest of his dominions sank into provinces of Spain, to be governed by Spanish viceroys, and sub-

ordinated to the policy and interests of a Spanish minister. All local liberties, all varieties of administration, all national differences, were set aside for a monotonous despotism which was wielded by Philip himself. It was his boast that everywhere in the vast compass of his dominions he was "an absolute king." It was to realize this idea of unshackled power that he crushed the liberties of Aragon, as his father had crushed the liberties of Castile, and sent Alva to tread under foot the constitutional freedom of the Low Countries. His bigotry went hand in hand with his thirst for rule. Catholicism was the one common bond that knit his realms together, and policy as well as religious faith made Philip the champion of Catholicism. Italy and Spain lay hushed beneath the terror of the Inquisition, while Flanders was being purged of heresy by the stake and the sword.

797. The shadow of this gigantic power fell like a deadly blight over Europe. The new Protestantism, like the new spirit of political liberty, saw its real foe in Philip. It was Spain rather than the Guises against which Coligny and the Huguenots struggled in vain; it was Spain with which William of Orange was wrestling for religious and civil freedom; it was Spain which was soon to plunge Germany into the chaos of the Thirty Years' war, and to which the Catholic world had for twenty years been looking, and looking in vain, for a victory over heresy in England. Vast, in fact, as Philip's resources were, they were drained by the yet vaster schemes of ambition into which his religion and his greed of power,

as well as the wide distribution of his dominions, perpetually drew him. To coerce the weaker states of Italy, to command the Mediterranean, to keep a hold on the African coast, to preserve his influence in Germany, to support Catholicism in France, to crush heresy in Flanders, to dispatch one armada against the Turk and another against England, were aims mighty enough to exhaust even the power of the Spanish monarchy. But it was rather on the character of Philip than on the exhaustion of his treasury that Elizabeth counted for success in the struggle which had so long been going on between them. The king's temper was slow, cautious even to timidity, losing itself continually in delays, in hesitations, in anticipating remote perils, in waiting for distant chances; and on the slowness and hesitation of his temper his rival had been playing ever since she mounted the throne. The agility, the sudden changes of Elizabeth, her lies, her mystifications, though they failed to deceive Philip, puzzled and impeded his mind. The diplomatic contest between the two was like the fight which England was soon to see between the ponderous Spanish galleon and the light pinnacle of the buccaneers.

798. But amid all the cloud of intrigue which disguised their policy, the actual course of their relations had been clear and simple. In the earlier years of Elizabeth, Philip had been driven to her alliance by his fear of France and his dread of the establishment of a French supremacy over England and Scotland through the accession of Mary Stuart. As time went on, the discontent and rising of the

Netherlands made it of hardly less import to avoid a strife with the queen. Had revolt in England prospered, or Mary Stuart succeeded in her countless plots, or Elizabeth fallen beneath an assassin's knife, Philip was ready to have struck in and reaped the fruits of other men's labors. But his stake was too vast to risk an attack while the queen sat firmly on her throne; and the cry of the English Catholics, or the pressure of the pope, failed to drive the Spanish king into strife with Elizabeth. But as the tide of religious passion, which had so long been held in check, broke over its banks, the political face of Europe changed. Philip had less to dread from France or from an English alliance with France. The abstinence of Elizabeth from intervention in the Netherlands was neutralized by the intervention of the English people. Above all, English hostility threatened Philip in a quarter where he was more sensitive than elsewhere, his dominions in the west.

799. Foiled as the ambition of Charles the Fifth had been in the Old World, his empire had widened with every year in the New. At his accession to the throne the Spanish rule had hardly spread beyond the island of St. Domingo, which Columbus had discovered twenty years before. But greed and enterprise drew Cortes to the main-land, and in 1521 his conquest of Mexico added a realm of gold to the dominions of the emperor. Ten years later the great empire of Peru yielded to the arms of Pizarro. With the conquest of Chili the whole western coast of South America passed into the hands of Spain; and successive expeditions planted the Spanish flag at

point upon point along the coast of the Atlantic from Florida to the river Plate. A papal grant had conveyed the whole of America to the Spanish crown, and fortune seemed for long years to ratify the judgment of the Vatican. No European nation save Portugal disputed the possession of the New World, and Portugal was too busy with its discoveries in Africa and India to claim more than the territory of Brazil. Though Francis the First sent seamen to explore the American coast, his ambition found other work at home; and a Huguenot colony which settled in Florida was cut to pieces by the Spaniards. Only in the far north did a few French settlers find rest beside the waters of the St. Lawrence. England had reached the main-land even earlier than Spain, for before Columbus touched its shores Sebastian Cabot, a seaman of Genoese blood, but born and bred in England, sailed with an English crew from Bristol in 1497, and pushed along the coast of America to the south as far as Florida, and northward as high as Hudson's bay. But no Englishman followed on the track of this bold adventurer; and while Spain built up her empire in the New World, the English seamen reaped a humbler harvest in the fisheries of Newfoundland.

800. There was little, therefore, in the circumstances which attended the first discovery of the western continent that promised well for freedom. Its one result as yet was to give an enormous impulse to the most bigoted and tyrannical among the powers of Europe, and to pour the gold of Mexico and Peru into the treasury of Spain. But as the reign of Eliz-

abeth went on, the thoughts of Englishmen turned again to the New World. A happy instinct drew them from the first not to the southern shores that Spain was conquering, but to the ruder and more barren districts of the north. In 1576 the dream of finding a passage to Asia by a voyage round the northern coast of the American continent drew a west-country seaman, Martin Frobisher, to the coast of Labrador; and, foiled as he was in his quest, the news he brought back of the existence of gold-mines there set adventurers cruising among the icebergs of Baffin's bay. Elizabeth herself joined in the venture; but the settlement proved a failure, the ore which the ships brought back turned out to be worthless, and England was saved from that greed of gold which was to be fatal to the energies of Spain. But failure as it was, Frobisher's venture had shown the readiness of Englishmen to defy the claims of Spain to the exclusive possession of America or the American seas. They were already defying these claims in a yet more galling way. The seamen of the southern and south-western coasts had long been carrying on a half-piratical war on their own account. Four years after Elizabeth's accession, the channel swarmed with "sea-dogs," as they were called, who sailed under letters of marque from Condé and the Huguenot leaders, and took heed neither of the complaints of the French court nor of their own queen's efforts at repression. Her efforts broke against the connivance of every man along the coast, of the very port officers of the crown, who made profit out of the spoil which the plunderers brought home, and of the gen-

try of the west, whose love of venture made them go hand in hand with the sea-dogs. They broke, above all, against the national craving for open fight with Spain, and the Protestant craving for open fight with Catholicism. If the queen held back from any formal part in the great war of religions across the channel, her subjects were keen to take their part in it. Young Englishmen crossed the sea to serve under Condé or Henry of Navarre. The war in the Netherlands drew hundreds of Protestants to the field. Their passionate longing for a religious war found a wider sphere on the sea. When the suspension of the French contest forced the sea-dogs to haul down the Huguenot flag, they joined in the cruises of the Dutch "sea-beggars." From plundering the vessels of Havre and Rochelle they turned to plunder the galleons of Spain.

801. Their outrages tried Philip's patience; but his slow resentment only quickened into angry alarm when the sea-dogs sailed westward to seek a richer spoil. The papal decree which gave the New World to Spain, the threats of the Spanish king against any Protestant who should visit its seas, fell idly on the ears of English seamen. Philip's care to save his new dominions from the touch of heresy was only equaled by his resolve to suffer no trade between them and other lands than Spain. But the sea-dogs were as ready to traffic as to fight. It was in vain that their vessels were seized and the sailors flung into the dungeons of the Inquisition, "laden with irons, without sight of sun or moon." The profits of the trade were large enough to counteract its perils:

and the bigotry of Philip was met by a bigotry as merciless as his own. The Puritanism of the sea-dogs went hand in hand with their love of adventure. To break through the Catholic monopoly of the New World, to kill Spaniards, to sell negroes, to sack gold-ships, were in these men's minds a seemly work for "the elect of God." The name of Francis Drake became the terror of the Spanish Indies. In Drake a Protestant fanaticism went hand in hand with a splendid daring. He conceived the design of penetrating into the Pacific, whose waters had till then never seen an English flag; and backed by a little company of adventurers, he set sail in 1577 for the southern seas in a vessel hardly as big as a channel schooner, with a few yet smaller companions, who fell away before the storms and perils of the voyage. But Drake, with his one ship and eighty men, held boldly on; and passing the straits of Magellan, untraversed as yet by any Englishman, swept the unguarded coast of Chili and Peru, loaded his bark with the gold-dust and silver ingots of Potosi, as well as with pearls, emeralds, and diamonds, which formed the cargo of the great galleon that sailed once a year from Lima to Cadiz. With spoils of above half a million in value, the daring adventurer steered undauntedly for the Moluccas, rounded the cape of Good Hope, and in 1580, after completing the circuit of the globe, dropped anchor again in Plymouth harbor.

802. The romantic daring of Drake's voyage as well as the vastness of his spoil roused a general enthusiasm throughout England. But the welcome

which he received from Elizabeth on his return was accepted by Philip as an outrage which could only be expiated by war. Sluggish as it was, the blood of the Spanish king was fired at last by the defiance with which the queen listened to all demands for redress. She met a request for Drake's surrender by knighting the freebooter and by wearing in her crown the jewels he offered her as a present. When the Spanish ambassador threatened that "matters would come to the cannon," she replied "quietly, in her most natural voice, as if she were telling a common story," wrote Mendoza, "that if I used threats of that kind she would fling me into a dungeon." Outraged indeed as Philip was, she believed that with the Netherlands still in revolt and France longing for her alliance to enable it to seize them, the king could not afford to quarrel with her. But the victories and diplomacy of Parma were already reassuring Philip in the Netherlands; while the alliance of Elizabeth with the revolted provinces convinced him at last that their reduction could best be brought about by an invasion of England and the establishment of Mary Stuart on its throne. With this conviction he lent himself to the plans of Rome, and waited only for the rising in Ireland and the revolt of the English Catholics which Pope Gregory promised him to dispatch forces from both Flanders and Spain. But the Irish rising was over before Philip could act; and before the Jesuits could rouse England to rebellion the Spanish king himself was drawn to a new scheme of ambition by the death of King Sebastian of Portugal in 1580. Philip claimed the Portuguese

crown; and in less than two months Alva laid the kingdom at his feet. The conquest of Portugal was fatal to the papal projects against England, for, while the armies of Spain marched on Lisbon, Elizabeth was able to throw the leaders of the future revolt into prison and to send Campian to the scaffold. On the other hand, it raised Philip into a far more formidable foe. The conquest almost doubled his power. His gain was far more than that of Portugal itself. While Spain had been winning the New World her sister-kingdom had been winning a wide though scattered dominion on the African coast, the coast of India, and the islands of the Pacific. Less in extent, the Portuguese settlements were at the moment of even greater value to the mother-country than the colonies of Spain. The gold of Guinea, the silks of Goa, the spices of the Philippines made Lisbon one of the marts of Europe. The sword of Alva had given Philip a hold on the richest trade of the world. It had given him the one navy that as yet rivaled his own. His flag claimed mastery in the Indian and the Pacific seas, as it claimed mastery in the Atlantic and Mediterranean.

803. The conquest of Portugal, therefore, wholly changed Philip's position. It not only doubled his power and resources, but it did this at a time when fortune seemed everywhere wavering to his side. The provinces of the Netherlands, which still maintained a struggle for their liberties, drew courage from despair; and met Philip's fresh hopes of their subjection by a solemn repudiation of his sovereignty in the summer of 1581. But they did not dream

that they could stand alone, and they sought the aid of France by choosing as their new sovereign the Duke of Alençon, who on his brother Henry's accession to the throne had become Duke of Anjou. The choice was only part of a political scheme which was to bind the whole of western Europe together against Spain. The conquest of Portugal had at once drawn France and England into close relations, and Catharine of Medicis strove to league the two countries by a marriage of Elizabeth with the Duke of Anjou. Such a match would have been a purely political one, for Elizabeth was now forty-eight, and Francis of Anjou had no qualities either of mind or body to recommend him to the queen. But the English ministers pressed for it, Elizabeth amid all her coqueties seemed at last ready to marry, and the states seized the moment to lend themselves to the alliance of the two powers by choosing the duke as their lord. Anjou accepted their offer, and, crossing to the Netherlands, drove Parma from Cambray; then sailing again to England, he spent the winter in a fresh wooing.

804. But the duke's wooing still proved fruitless. The schemes of diplomacy found themselves shattered against the religious enthusiasm of the time. While Orange and Catharine and Elizabeth saw only the political weight of the marriage as a check upon Philip, the sterner Protestants in England saw in it a victory for Catholicism at home. Of the difference between the bigoted Catholicism of Spain and the more tolerant Catholicism of the court of France such men recked nothing. The memory of St. Bar-

tholomew's day hung around Catharine of Medicis; and the success of the Jesuits at this moment roused the dread of a general conspiracy against Protestantism. A Puritan lawyer named Stubbs only expressed the alarm of his fellows in his "Discovery of a Gaping Gulf" in which England was to plunge through the match with Anjou. When the hand of the pamphleteer was cut off as a penalty for his daring, Stubbs waved his hat with the hand that was left, and cried "God save Queen Elizabeth." But the queen knew how stern a fanaticism went with this unflinching loyalty, and her dread of a religious conflict within her realm must have quickened the fears which the worthless temper of her wooer cannot but have inspired. She gave, however, no formal refusal of her hand. So long as coquetry sufficed to hold France and England together, she was ready to play the coquette; and it was as the future husband of the queen that Anjou again appeared in 1582 in the Netherlands and received the formal submission of the revolted states, save Holland and Zealand. But the subtle schemes which centered in him broke down before the selfish perfidy of the duke. Resolved to be ruler in more than name, he planned the seizure of the greater cities of the Netherlands, and at the opening of 1583 made a fruitless effort to take Antwerp by surprise. It was in vain that Orange strove by patient negotiation to break the blow. The duke fled homewards, the match and sovereignty were at an end, the alliance of the three powers vanished like a dream. The last Catholic provinces passed over to Parma's side; the weakened Netherlands found

themselves parted from France; and at the close of 1588 Elizabeth saw herself left face to face with Philip of Spain.

805. Nor was this all. At home as well as abroad troubles were thickening around the queen. The fanaticism of the Catholic world without was stirring a Protestant fanaticism within the realm. As Rome became more and more the center of hostility to England, patriotism itself stirred men to a hatred of Rome; and their hatred of Rome passed easily into a love for the fiercer and sterner Calvinism which looked on all compromise with Rome, or all acceptance of religious traditions or usages which had been associated with Rome, as treason against God. Puritanism, as this religious temper was called, was becoming the creed of every earnest Protestant throughout the realm; and the demand for a further advance toward the Calvinistic system, and a more open breach with Catholicism, which was embodied in the suppression of the "superstitious usages," became stronger than ever. But Elizabeth was firm as of old to make no advance. Greatly as the Protestants had grown, she knew they were still a minority in the realm. If the hotter Catholics were fast decreasing, they remained a large and important body. But the mass of the nation was neither Catholic nor Protestant. It had lost faith in the papacy. It was slowly drifting to a new faith in the Bible. But it still clung obstinately to the past; it still recoiled from violent change; its temper was religious rather than theological, and it shrank from the fanaticism of Geneva as it shrank from the fanat-

icism of Rome. It was a proof of Elizabeth's genius that alone among her counselors she understood this drift of opinion, and withstood measures which would have startled the mass of Englishmen into a new resistance.

806. But her policy was wider than her acts. The growing Puritanism of the clergy stirred her wrath above measure, and she met the growth of "nonconforming" ministers by conferring new powers, in 1583, on the ecclesiastical commission. From being a temporary board which represented the royal supremacy in matters ecclesiastical, the commission was now turned into a permanent body, wielding the almost unlimited powers of the crown. All opinions or acts contrary to the statutes of supremacy and uniformity fell within its cognizance. A right of deprivation placed the clergy at its mercy. It had power to alter or amend the statutes of colleges or schools. Not only heresy and schism, and nonconformity, but incest or aggravated adultery were held to fall within its scope; its means of inquiry were left without limit, and it might fine or imprison at its will. By the mere establishment of such a court half the work of the reformation was undone. The large number of civilians on the board, indeed, seemed to furnish some security against the excess of ecclesiastical tyranny. Of its forty-four commissioners, however, few actually took any part in its proceedings; and the powers of the commission were practically left in the hands of the successive primates. No archbishop of Canterbury, since the days of Augustine, had wielded an authority so

vast, so utterly despotic, as that of Whitgift and Bancroft, and Abbot, and Laud. The most terrible feature of their spiritual tyranny was its wholly personal character. The old symbols of doctrine were gone, and the lawyers had not yet stepped in to protect the clergy by defining the exact limits of the new. The result was that at the commission-board at Lambeth, the primates created their own tests of doctrine with an utter indifference to those created by law. In one instance, Parker deprived a vicar of his benefice for a denial of the verbal inspiration of the Bible. Nor did the successive archbishops care greatly if the test was a varying or a conflicting one. Whitgift strove to force on the church the Calvinistic supralapsarianism of his Lambeth articles. Bancroft, who followed him, was as earnest in enforcing his anti-Calvinistic dogma of the divine right of the episcopate. Abbot had no mercy for Erastians. Laud had none for anti-Erastians. It is no wonder that the ecclesiastical commission, which these men represented, soon stank in the nostrils of the English clergy. Its establishment, however, marked the adoption of a more resolute policy on the part of the crown, and its efforts were backed by stern measures of repression. All preaching or reading in private houses was forbidden; and in spite of the refusal of parliament to enforce the requirement of them by law, subscription to the three articles was exacted from every member of the clergy. For the moment, these measures were crowned with success. The movement which Cartwright still headed was checked; Cartwright himself was driven from

his professorship; and an outer uniformity of worship was more and more brought about by the steady pressure of the commission. The old liberty which had been allowed in London and the other Protestant parts of the kingdom was no longer permitted to exist. The leading Puritan clergy, whose nonconformity had hitherto been winked at, were called upon to submit to the surplice, and to make the sign of the cross in baptism. The remonstrance of the country gentry availed as little as the protest of Lord Burleigh himself to protect 200 of the best ministers from being driven from their parsonages on a refusal to subscribe to the three articles.

807. But the political danger of the course on which the crown had entered was seen in the rise of a spirit of vigorous opposition, such as had not made its appearance since the accession of the Tudors. The growing power of public opinion received a striking recognition in the struggle which bears the name of the "Martin Marprelate controversy." The Puritans had from the first appealed by their pamphlets from the crown to the people, and Archbishop Whitgift bore witness to their influence on opinion by his efforts to gag the press. The regulations made by the Star-chamber in 1585 for this purpose are memorable as the first step in the long struggle of government after government to check the liberty of printing. The irregular censorship which had long existed was now finally organized. Printing was restricted to London and the two universities, the number of printers was reduced, and all applicants for license to print were placed under the supervis-

ion of the company of stationers. Every publication, too, great or small, had to receive the approbation of the primate, or the Bishop of London. The first result of this system of repression was the appearance, in the very year of the Armada, of a series of anonymous pamphlets bearing the significant name of "Martin Marprelate," and issued from a secret press, which found refuge from the royal pursuivants in the country-houses of the gentry. The press was at last seized; and the suspected authors of these scurrilous libels, Penry, a young Welshman, and a minister named Udaſl, died, the one in prison, the other on the scaffold. But the virulence and boldness of their language produced a powerful effect, for it was impossible under the system of Elizabeth to "mar" the bishops without attacking the crown; and a new age of political liberty was felt to be at hand when Martin Marprelate forced the political and ecclesiastical measures of the government into the arena of public discussion.

808. The strife between Puritanism and the crown was to grow into a fatal conflict, but at the moment the queen's policy was in the main a wise one. It was no time for scaring and disuniting the mass of the people when the united energies of England might soon hardly suffice to withstand the onset of Spain. On the other hand, strike as she might at the Puritan party, it was bound to support Elizabeth in the coming struggle with Philip. For the sense of personal wrong, and the outcry of the Catholic world against his selfish reluctance to avenge the blood of its martyrs had at last told on the Spanish

king, and in 1584 the first vessels of an armada which was destined for the conquest of England began to gather in the Tagus. Resentment and fanaticism, indeed, were backed by a cool policy. The gain of the Portuguese dominions made it only the more needful for Philip to assert his mastery of the seas. He had now to shut Englishman and heretic, not only out of the new world of the west, but out of the lucrative traffic with the east. And every day showed a firmer resolve in Englishmen to claim the new world for their own. The plunder of Drake's memorable voyage had lured fresh freebooters to the "Spanish Main." The failure of Frobisher's quest for gold only drew the nobler spirits engaged in it to plans of colonization. North America, vexed by long winters and thinly peopled by warlike tribes of Indians, gave a rough welcome to the earlier colonists; and after a fruitless attempt to form a settlement on its shores, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, one of the noblest spirits of his time, turned homeward again to find his fate in the stormy seas. "We are as near to heaven by sea as by land," were the famous words he was heard to utter ere the light of his little bark was lost forever in the darkness of the night. But an expedition sent by his brother-in-law, Sir Walter Raleigh, explored Pamlico sound; and the country they discovered, a country where, in their poetic fancy, "men lived after the manner of the golden age," received from Elizabeth, the Virgin queen, the name of Virginia.

809. It was in England only that Philip could maintain his exclusive right to the new world of the

west; it was through England only that he could strike a last and fatal blow at the revolt of the Netherlands. And foiled as his plans had been as yet by the overthrow of the papal schemes, even their ruin had left ground for hope in England itself. The tortures and hangings of the Catholic priests, the fining and imprisonment of the Catholic gentry, had roused a resentment which it was easy to mistake for disloyalty. The Jesuits, with Parsons at their head, pictured the English Catholics as only waiting to rise in rebellion at the call of Spain, and reported long lists of nobles and squires who would muster their tenants to join Parma's legions on their landing. A Spanish victory would be backed by insurrection in Ireland and attack from Scotland. For in Scotland the last act of the papal conspiracy against Elizabeth was still being played. Though as yet under age, the young king, James the Sixth, had taken on himself the government of the realm, and had submitted to the guidance of a cousin, Esme Stuart, who had been brought up in France and returned to Scotland a Catholic and a fellow-plotter with the Guises. He succeeded in bringing Morton to the block; and the death of the great Protestant leader left him free to enlist Scotland in the league which Rome was forming for the ruin of Elizabeth. The revolt in Ireland had failed. The work of the Jesuits in England had just ended in the death of Campian and the arrest of his fellows. But with the help of the Guises Scotland might yet be brought to rise in arms for the liberation of Mary Stuart, and James might reign as co-regent with his mother if he

were converted to the Catholic church. The young king, anxious to free his crown from the dictation of the nobles, lent himself to his cousin's schemes. For the moment they were foiled. James was seized by the Protestant lords, and the Duke of Lennox, as Esme Stuart was now called, driven from the realm. But James was soon free again, and again in correspondence with the Guises and with Philip. The young king was lured by promises of the hand of an archduchess and the hope of the crowns of both England and Scotland. The real aim of the intriguers who guided him was to set him aside as soon as the victory was won and to restore his mother to the throne. But, whether Mary were restored or no, it seemed certain that in any attack on Elizabeth Spain would find helpers from among the Scots.

810. Nor was the opportunity favorable in Scotland alone. In the Netherlands and in France all seemed to go well for Philip's schemes. From the moment of his arrival in the Low Countries the Prince of Parma had been steadily winning back what Alva had lost. The Union of Ghent had been broken. The ten Catholic provinces were being slowly brought anew under Spanish rule. Town after town was regained. From Brabant Parma had penetrated into Flanders; Ypres, Bruges, and Ghent had fallen into his hands. Philip dealt a more fatal blow at his rebellious subjects in the murder of the man who was the center of their resistance. For years past William of Orange had been a mark for assassin after assassin in Philip's pay, and in 1584 the deadly persistence of the

Spanish king was rewarded by his fall. Reft, indeed, as they were of their leader, the Netherlanders still held their ground. The Union of Utrecht stood intact; and Philip's work of conquest might be checked at any moment by the intervention of England or of France. But at this moment all chance of French intervention had passed away. Henry the Third was childless, and the death of his one remaining brother, Francis of Anjou, in 1584, left the young chief of the house of Bourbon, King Henry of Navarre, heir to the crown of France. Henry was the leader of the Huguenot party, and in January, 1585, the French Catholics bound themselves in a holy league to prevent such a triumph of heresy in the realm as the reign of a Protestant would bring about by securing the succession of Henry's uncle, the cardinal of Bourbon. The leaguers looked to Philip for support; they owned his cause for their own; and pledged themselves not only to root out Protestantism in France, but to help the Spanish king in rooting it out throughout the Netherlands. The league at once overshadowed the crown; and Henry the Third could only meet the blow by affecting to put himself at its head, and by revoking the edicts of toleration in favor of the Huguenots. But the Catholics disbelieved in his sincerity; they looked only to Philip; and as long as Philip could supply the leaguers with men and money, he felt secure on the side of France.

811. The vanishing of all hope of French aid was the more momentous to the Netherlands that at this moment Parma won his crowning triumph in the

capture of Antwerp. Besieged in the winter of 1584, the city surrendered after a brave resistance in the August of 1585. But, heavy as was the blow, it brought gain as well as loss to the Netherlands. It forced Elizabeth into action. She refused, indeed, the title of Protector of the Netherlands which the states offered her, and compelled them to place Brill and Flushing in her hands as pledges for the repayment of her expenses. But she sent aid. Lord Leicester was hurried to the Flemish coast with 8000 men. In a yet bolder spirit of defiance Francis Drake was suffered to set sail with a fleet of twenty-five vessels for the Spanish main. The two expeditions had very different fortunes. Drake's voyage was a series of triumphs. The wrongs inflicted on English seamen by the Inquisition were requited by the burning of the cities of St. Domingo and Carthagena. The coasts of Cuba and Florida were plundered, and, though the gold fleet escaped him, Drake returned in the summer of 1586 with a heavy booty. Leicester, on the other hand, was paralyzed by his own intriguing temper, by strife with the queen, and by his military incapacity. Only one disastrous skirmish at Zutphen broke the inaction of his forces, while Elizabeth strove vainly to use the presence of his army to force Parma and the states alike to a peace which would restore Philip's sovereignty over the Netherlands, but leave them free enough to serve as a check on Philip's designs against herself.

812. Foiled as she was in securing a check on Philip in the Low Countries, the queen was more successful in robbing him of the aid of the Scots.

---

The action of King James had been guided by his greed of the English crown, and a secret promise of the succession sufficed to lure him from the cause of Spain. In July, 1586, he formed an alliance, defensive and offensive, with Elizabeth, and pledged himself not only to give no aid to revolt in Ireland, but to suppress any Catholic rising in the northern counties. The pledge was the more important that the Catholic resentment seemed passing into fanaticism. Maddened by confiscation and persecution, by the hopelessness of rebellion within or of deliverance from without, the fiercer Catholics listened to schemes of assassination to which the murder of William of Orange lent a terrible significance. The detection of Somerville, a fanatic who had received the host before setting out for London "to shoot the queen with his dagger," was followed by measures of natural severity, by the flight and arrest of Catholic gentry and peers, by a vigorous purification of the Inns of Court, where a few Catholics lingered, and by the dispatch of fresh batches of priests to the block. The trial and death of Parry, a member of the house of commons who had served in the royal household, on a similar charge, fed the general panic. The leading Protestants formed an association whose members pledged themselves to pursue to the death all who sought the queen's life, and all on whose behalf it was sought. The association soon became national, and the parliament met together in a transport of horror and loyalty to give it legal sanction. All Jesuits and seminary priests were banished from the realm on pain of death, and a bill for the security

of the queen disqualified any claimant of the succession who instigated subjects to rebellion or hurt to the queen's person from ever succeeding to the crown.

813. The threat was aimed at Mary Stuart. Weary of her long restraint, of her failure to rouse Philip or Scotland to her aid, of the baffled revolt of the English Catholics and the baffled intrigues of the Jesuits, Mary had bent for a moment to submission. "Let me go," she wrote to Elizabeth; "let me retire from this island to some solitude where I may prepare my soul to die. Grant this and I will sign away every right which either I or mine can claim." But the cry was useless, and in 1586 her despair found a new and more terrible hope in the plots against Elizabeth's life. She knew and approved the vow of Anthony Babington and a band of young Catholics, for the most part connected with the royal household, to kill the queen and seat Mary on the throne; but plot and approval alike passed through Walsingham's hands, and the seizure of Mary's correspondence revealed her connivance in the scheme. Babington with his fellow-conspirators were at once sent to the block, and the provisions of the act passed in the last parliament were put in force against Mary. In spite of her protests a commission of peers sat as her judges at Fotheringay castle, and their verdict of "guilty" annihilated under the provisions of the statute her claim to the crown. The streets of London blazed with bonfires, and peals rang out from steeple to steeple, at the news of Mary's condemnation; but in spite of the prayer of Parliament for her execution and the pressure of the council Elizabeth

shrank from her death. The force of public opinion, however, was now carrying all before it, and after three months of hesitation the unanimous demand of her people wrested a sullen consent from the queen. She flung the warrant, signed, upon the floor, and the council took on themselves the responsibility of executing it. On the 8th of February, 1587, Mary died on a scaffold which was erected in the castle-hall at Fotheringay as dauntlessly as she had lived. "Do not weep," she said to her ladies, "I have given my word for you." "Tell my friends," she charged Melville, "that I die a good Catholic."

814. The blow was hardly struck before Elizabeth turned with fury on the ministers who had forced her hand. Cecil, who had now become Lord Burghley, was for a while disgraced, and Davison, who carried the warrant to the council, was sent to the Tower to atone for an act which shattered the policy of the queen. The death of Mary Stuart, in fact, seemed to have removed the last obstacle out of Philip's way. It had put an end to the divisions of the English Catholics. To the Spanish king, as to the nearest heir in blood who was of the Catholic faith, Mary bequeathed her rights to the crown, and the hopes of her more passionate adherents were from that moment bound up in the success of Spain. The blow, too, kindled afresh the fervor of the papacy, and Sixtus the Fifth offered to aid Philip with money in his invasion of the heretic realm. But Philip no longer needed pressure to induce him to act. Drake's triumph had taught him that the conquest of England was needful for the security of

his dominion in the New World, and for the mastery of the seas. The presence of an English army in Flanders convinced him that the road to the conquest of the states lay through England itself. Nor did the attempt seem a very perilous one. Allen and his Jesuit emissaries assured Philip that the bulk of the nation was ready to rise as soon as a strong Spanish force was landed on English shores. They numbered off the great lords who would head the revolt, the Earls of Arundel and Northumberland, who were both Catholics, the Earls of Worcester, Cumberland, Oxford, and Southampton, Viscount Montacute, the Lords Dacres, Morley, Vaux, Wharton, Windsor, Lumley, and Stourton. "All these," wrote Allen, "will follow our party when they see themselves supported by a sufficient foreign force." Against these were only "the new nobles, who are hated in the country," and the towns. "But the strength of England is not in its towns." All the more warlike counties were Catholic in their sympathies; and the persecution of the recusants had destroyed the last traces of their loyalty to the queen. Three hundred priests had been sent across the sea to organize the insurrection, and they were circulating a book which Allen had lately published "to prove that it is not only lawful but our bounden duty to take up arms at the Pope's bidding, and to fight for the Catholic faith against the queen and other heretics." A landing in the Pope's name would be best, but a landing in Philip's name would be almost as secure of success. Trained as they were now by Allen and his three hundred priests, English Catholics "would

let in Catholic auxiliaries of any nation, for they have learned to hate their domestic heretic more than any foreign power."

815. What truth there was in the Jesuit view of England, time was to prove. But there can be no doubt that Philip believed it, and that the promise of a Catholic rising was his chief inducement to attempt an invasion. The operations of Parma, therefore, were suspended with a view to the greater enterprise, and vessels and supplies for the fleet which had for three years been gathering in the Tagus were collected from every port of the Spanish coast. Only France held Philip back. He dared not attack England till all dread of a counter-attack from France was removed; and though the rise of the league had seemed to secure this, its success had now become more doubtful. The king, who had striven to embarrass it by placing himself at its head, gathered round him the politicians and the moderate Catholics who saw in the triumph of the new Duke of Guise the ruin of the monarchy; while Henry of Navarre took the field at the head of the Huguenots, and won in 1587 the victory of Coutras. Guise restored the balance by driving the German allies of Henry from the realm; but the Huguenots were still unconquered, and the king, standing apart, fed a struggle which lightened for him the pressure of the league. Philip was forced to watch the wavering fortunes of the struggle, but while he watched, another blow fell on him from the sea. The news of the coming Armada called Drake again to action. In April, 1587, he set sail with thirty small barks, burned the store-ships

and galleys in the harbor of Cadiz, stormed the ports of the Faro, and was only foiled in his aim of attacking the Armada itself by orders from home. A descent upon Corunna, however, completed what Drake called his "singeing of the Spanish king's beard." Elizabeth used the daring blow to back some negotiations for peace which she was still conducting in the Netherlands. But on Philip's side, at least, these negotiations were simply delusive. The Spanish pride had been touched to the quick. Amid the exchange of protocols Parma gathered 17,000 men for the coming invasion, collected a fleet of flat-bottomed transports at Dunkirk, and waited impatiently for the Armada to protect his crossing. The attack of Drake, however, the death of its first admiral, and the winter storms delayed the fleet from sailing. What held it back even more effectually was the balance of parties in France. But in the spring of 1588 Philip's patience was rewarded. The league had been baffled till now not so much by the resistance of the Huguenots as by the attitude of the king. So long as Henry the Third held aloof from both parties and gave a rallying point to the party of moderation the victory of the leaguers was impossible. The difficulty was solved by the daring of Henry of Guise. The fanatical populace of Paris rose at his call; the royal troops were beaten off from the barricades; and on the 12th of May, the king found himself a prisoner in the hands of the duke. Guise was made lieutenant-general of the kingdom, and Philip was assured on the side of France.

•

816. The revolution was hardly over when, at the end of May, the Armada started from Lisbon. But it had scarcely put to sea when a gale in the bay of Biscay drove its scattered vessels into Ferrol, and it was only on the 19th of July, 1588, that the sails of the Armada were seen from the Lizard, and the English beacons flared out their alarm along the coast. The news found England ready. An army was mustering under Leicester and Tilbury, the militia of the midland counties were gathering to London, while those of the south and east were held in readiness to meet a descent on either shore. The force which Parma hoped to lead consisted of 40,000 men, for the Armada brought nearly 22,000 soldiers to be added to the 17,000 who were waiting to cross from the Netherlands. Formidable as this force was, it was far too weak by itself to do the work which Philip meant it to do. Had Parma landed on the earliest day he purposed, he would have found his way to London barred by a force stronger than his own, a force, too, of men in whose ranks were many who had already crossed pikes on equal terms with his best infantry in Flanders. "When I shall have landed," he warned his master, "I must fight battle after battle, I shall lose men by wounds and disease; I must leave detachments behind me to keep open my communications; and in a short time the body of my army will become so weak that not only I may be unable to advance in the face of the enemy, and time may be given to the heretics and your majesty's other enemies to interfere, but there may fall out some notable inconveniences, with the loss of every-

thing, and I be unable to remedy it." What Philip really counted on was the aid which his army would find within England itself. Parma's chance of victory, if he succeeded in landing, lay in a Catholic rising. But at this crisis patriotism proved stronger than religious fanaticism in the hearts of the English Catholics. The news of invasion ran like fire along the English coasts. The whole nation answered the queen's appeal. Instinct told England that its work was to be done at sea, and the royal fleet was soon lost among the vessels of the volunteers. London, when Elizabeth asked for fifteen ships and 5,000 men, offered thirty ships and 10,000 seamen, while 10,000 of its train-bands drilled in the artillery ground. Every sea-port showed the same temper. Coasters put out from every little harbor. Squires and merchants pushed off in their own little barks for a brush with the Spaniards. In the presence of the stranger all religious strife was forgotten. The work of the Jesuits was undone in an hour. Of the nobles and squires whose tenants were to muster under the flag of the invader, not one proved a traitor. The greatest lords on Allen's list of Philip's helpers, Cumberland, Oxford, and Northumberland, brought their vessels up alongside of Drake and Lord Howard as soon as Philip's fleet appeared in the channel. The Catholic gentry, who had been painted as long-ing for the coming of the stranger, led their tenantry, when the stranger came, to the muster of Tilbury.

817. The loyalty of the Catholics decided the fate of Philip's scheme. Even if Parma's army succeeded in landing, its task was now an impossible one.

Forty thousand Spaniards were no match for 4,000,000 of Englishmen, banded together by a common resolve to hold England against the foreigner. But to secure a landing at all, the Spaniards had to be masters of the channel. Parma might gather his army on the Flemish coast, but every estuary and inlet was blocked by the Dutch cruisers. The Netherlands knew well that the conquest of England was planned only as a prelude to their own reduction; and the enthusiasm with which England rushed to the conflict was hardly greater than that which stirred the Hollanders. A fleet of ninety vessels, with the best Dutch seamen at their head, held the Scheldt and the shallows of Dunkirk, and it was only by driving this fleet from the water that Parma's army could be set free to join in the great enterprise. The great need of the Armada, therefore, was to reach the coast of Flanders. It was ordered to make for Calais, and wait there for the junction of Parma. But even if Parma joined it, the passage of his force was impossible without a command of the channel; and in the channel lay an English fleet resolved to struggle hard for the mastery. As the Armada sailed on in a broad crescent past Plymouth, the vessels which had gathered under Lord Howard of Effingham slipped out of the bay and hung with the wind upon their rear. In numbers the two forces were strangely unequal, for the English fleet counted only eighty vessels against the 132 which composed the Armada. In size of ships the disproportion was even greater. Fifty of the English vessels, including the squadron of the lord admiral and the craft of the

volunteers, were little bigger than yachts of the present day. Even of the thirty queen's ships which formed its main body, there were but four which equaled in tonnage the smallest of the Spanish galleons. Sixty-five of these galleons formed the most formidable half of the Spanish fleet; and four galleasses, or gigantic galleys, armed with fifty guns apiece, fifty-six armed merchantmen, and twenty pinnaces made up the rest. The Armada was provided with 2,500 cannons, and a vast store of provisions; it had on board 8,000 seamen and more than 20,000 soldiers; and if a court-favorite, the Duke of Medina Sidonia, had been placed at its head, he was supported by the ablest staff of naval officers which Spain possessed.

818. Small, however, as the English ships were, they were in perfect trim; they sailed two feet for the Spaniards' one; they were manned with 9,000 hardy seamen, and their admiral was backed by a crowd of captains who had won fame in the Spanish seas. With him was Hawkins, who had been the first to break into the charmed circle of the Indies; Frobisher, the hero of the northwest passage; and, above all, Drake, who held command of the privateers. They had won, too, the advantage of the wind; and, closing in or drawing off as they would, the lightly-handled English vessels, which fired four shots to the Spaniards' one, hung boldly on the rear of the great fleet as it moved along the channel. "The feathers of the Spaniard," in the phrase of the English seamen, were "plucked one by one." Galleon after galleon was sunk, boarded, driven on

shore; and yet Medina Sidonia failed in bringing his pursuers to a close engagement. Now halting, now moving slowly on, the running fight between the two fleets lasted throughout the week, till on Sunday, the 28th of July, the Armada dropped anchor in Calais roads. The time had come for sharper work if the junction of the Armada with Parma was to be prevented; for, demoralized as the Spaniards had been by the merciless chase, their loss in ships had not been great, and their appearance off Dunkirk might drive off the ships of the Hollanders who hindered the sailing of the duke. On the other hand, though the numbers of English ships had grown, their supplies of food and ammunition were fast running out. Howard, therefore, resolved to force an engagement; and, lighting eight fire-ships at midnight, sent them down with the tide upon the Spanish line. The galleons at once cut their cables, and stood out in panic to sea, drifting with the wind in a long line off Grave-lines. Drake resolved at all costs to prevent their return. At dawn on the 29th the English ships closed fairly in, and almost their last cartridge was spent ere the sun went down.

819. Hard as the fight had been, it seemed far from a decisive one. Three great galleons, indeed, had sunk in the engagement, three had drifted helplessly on to the Flemish coast, but the bulk of the Spanish vessels remained, and even to Drake the fleet seemed "wonderful great and strong." Within the Armada itself, however, all hope was gone. Huddled together by the wind and the deadly English fire, their sails torn, their masts shot away, the

crowded galleons had become mere slaughter-houses. Four thousand men had fallen, and bravely as the seamen fought, they were cowed by the terrible butchery. Medina himself was in despair. "We are lost, Señor Oquenda," he cried to his bravest captain: "what are we to do?" "Let others talk of being lost," replied Oquenda, "your excellency has only to order up fresh cartridge." But Oquenda stood alone, and a council of war resolved on retreat to Spain by the one course open, that of a circuit round the Orkneys. "Never anything pleased me better," wrote Drake, "than seeing the enemy fly with a southerly wind to the northwards. Have a good eye to the Prince of Parma, for, with the grace of God, I doubt not ere it be long so to handle the matter with the Duke of Sidonia as he shall wish himself at St. Mary Port among his orange trees." But the work of destruction was reserved for a mightier foe than Drake. The English vessels were soon forced to give up the chase by the running out of their supplies. But the Spanish ships had no sooner reached the Orkneys than the storms of the northern seas broke on them with a fury before which all concert and union disappeared. In October fifty reached Corunna, bearing 10,000 men stricken with pestilence and death. Of the rest some were sunk, some dashed to pieces against the Irish cliffs. The wreckers of the Orkneys and the Faroes, the clansmen of the Scottish isles, the kernes of Donegal and Galway, all had their part in the work of murder and robbery. Eight thousand Spaniards perished between the Giant's Causeway and the Blaskets.

On a strand near Sligo an English captain numbered 1100 corpses which had been cast up by the sea. The flower of the Spanish nobility, who had been sent on the new crusade under Alonzo de Leyva, after twice suffering shipwreck, put a third time to sea to founder on a reef near Dunluce.

820. "I sent my ships against men," said Philip when the news reached him, "not against the seas." It was in nobler tone that England owned her debt to the storm that drove the Armada to its doom. On the medal that commemorated its triumph were graven the words, "The Lord sent his wind, and scattered them." The pride of the conquerors was hushed before their sense of a mighty deliverance. It was not till England saw the broken host, "fly with a southerly wind to the north" that she knew what a weight of fear she had borne for thirty years. The victory over the Armada, the deliverance from Spain, the rolling away of the Catholic terror which had hung like a cloud over the hopes of the new people, was like a passing from death unto life. Within as without, the dark sky suddenly cleared. The national unity proved stronger than the religious strife. When the Catholic lords flocked to the camp at Tilbury, or put off to join the fleet in the channel, Elizabeth could pride herself on a victory as great as the victory over the Armada. She had won it by her patience and moderation, by her refusal to lend herself to the fanaticism of the Puritan or the reaction of the Papist, by her sympathy with the mass of the people, by her steady and unflinching preference of national unity to any passing considerations

of safety or advantage. For thirty years amid the shock of religious passions at home and abroad, she had reigned not as a Catholic or as a Protestant queen, but as a Queen of England, and it was to England, Catholic and Protestant alike, that she could appeal in her hour of need. "Let tyrants fear," she exclaimed in words that still ring like the sound of a trumpet, as she appeared among her soldiers,— "let tyrants fear! I have always so behaved myself that under God I have placed my chiefest strength and safeguard in the loyal hearts and good-will of my subjects! And therefore I am come among you, as you see, resolved in the midst and heat of the battle to live and die among you all." The work of Edward and of Mary was undone, and the strife of religions fell powerless before the sense of a common country.

821. Nor were the results of the victory less momentous to Europe at large. What Wolsey and Henry had struggled for, Elizabeth had done. At her accession England was scarcely reckoned among European powers. The wisest statesmen looked on her as doomed to fall into the hands of France, or to escape that fate by remaining a dependency of Spain. But the national independence had grown with the national life. France was no longer a danger; Scotland was no longer a foe. Instead of hanging on the will of Spain, England had fronted Spain and conquered her. She now stood on a footing of equality with the greatest powers of the world. Her military weight, indeed, was drawn from the discord which rent peoples about her, and

would pass away with its close. But a new and lasting greatness opened on the sea. She had sprung at a bound into a great sea-power. Her fleets were spreading terror through the New World as through the Old. When Philip by his conquest of Portugal had gathered the two greatest navies of the world into his single hand, England had faced him and driven his fleet from the seas. But the rise of England was even less memorable than the fall of Spain. That Spain had fallen, few of the world's statesmen saw then. Philip thanked God that he could easily, if he chose, "place another fleet upon the seas," and the despatch of a second armada soon afterward showed that his boast was a true one. But what had vanished was his mastery of the seas. The defeat of the Armada was the first of a series of defeats at the hands of the English and the Dutch. The naval supremacy of Spain was lost, and with it all was lost. An empire so widely scattered over the world, and whose dominions were parted by intervening nations, could only be held together by its command of the seas. One century saw Spain stripped of the bulk of the Netherlands, another of her possessions in Italy, a third of her dominions in the New World. But slowly as her empire broke, the cause of ruin was throughout the same. It was the loss of her maritime supremacy that robbed her of all, and her maritime supremacy was lost in the wreck of the Armada.

822. If Philip met the shock with a calm patience, it at once ruined his plans in the west. France broke again from his grasp. Since the day of the

barricades Henry the Third had been virtually a prisoner in the hands of the Duke of Guise; but the defeat of the Armada woke him to a new effort for the recovery of power, and at the close of 1588 Guise was summoned to his presence and stabbed as he entered by the royal body-guard. The blow broke the strength of the league. The Duke of Mayenne, a brother of the victim, called indeed the leaguers to arms, and made war upon the king. But Henry found help in his cousin, Henry of Navarre, who brought a Huguenot force to his aid; and the moderate Catholics rallied as of old round the crown. The leaguers called on Philip for aid, but Philip was forced to guard against attack at home. Elizabeth had resolved to give blow for blow. The Portuguese were writhing under Spanish conquest; and a claimant of the crown, Don Antonio, who had found refuge in England, promised that on his landing the country would rise in arms. In the spring of 1589, therefore, an expedition of fifty vessels and 15,000 men was sent under Drake and Sir John Norris against Lisbon. Its chances of success hung on a quick arrival in Portugal, but the fleet touched at Corunna, and after burning the ships in its harbor, the army was tempted to besiege the town. A Spanish army which advanced to its relief was repulsed by an English force of half its numbers. Corunna, however, held stubbornly out, and in the middle of May Norris was forced to break the siege and to sail to Lisbon. But the delay had been fatal to his enterprise. The country did not rise; the English troops were thinned with sickness; want of

cannon hindered a siege; and after a fruitless march up the Tagus Norris fell back on the fleet. The coast was pillaged, and the expedition returned baffled to England. Luckless as the campaign had proved, the bold defiance of Spain and the defeat of a Spanish army on Spanish ground kindled a new daring in Englishmen, while they gave new heart to Philip's enemies. In the summer of 1589 Henry the Third laid siege to Paris. The fears of the league were removed by the knife of a priest, Jacques Clement, who assassinated the king in August; but Henry of Navarre, or, as he now became, Henry the Fourth, stood next to him in line of blood, and Philip saw with dismay a Protestant mount the throne of France.

823. From this moment the thought of attack on England, even his own warfare in the Netherlands, was subordinated in the mind of the Spanish king to the need of crushing Henry the Fourth. It was not merely that Henry's Protestantism threatened to spread heresy over the west. Catholic or Protestant, the union of France under an active and enterprising ruler would be equally fatal to Philip's designs. Once gathered round its king, France was a nearer obstacle to the reconquest of the Netherlands than ever England could be. On the other hand, the religious strife, to which Henry's accession gave a fresh life and vigor, opened wide prospects to Philip's ambition. Far from proving a check upon Spain, it seemed as if France might be turned into a Spanish dependency. While the leaguers proclaimed the Cardinal of Bourbon king, under the name of Charles

the Tenth, they recognized Philip as Protector of France. Their hope, indeed, lay in his aid, and their army was virtually his own. On the other hand, Henry the Fourth was environed with difficulties. It was only by declaring his willingness to be "further instructed" in matters of faith, in other words by holding out hopes of his conversion, that he succeeded in retaining the moderate Catholics under his standard. His desperate bravery alone won a victory at Yvry over the forces of the league, which enabled him to again form the siege of Paris in 1590. All recognized Paris as the turning point in the struggle, and the league called loudly for Philip's aid. To give it was to break the work which Parma was doing in the Netherlands, and to allow the United Provinces a breathing space in their sorest need. But even the Netherlands were of less moment than the loss of France; and Philip's orders forced Parma to march to the relief of Paris. The work was done with a skill which proved the duke to be a master in the art of war. The siege of Paris was raised; the efforts of Henry to bring the Spaniards to an engagement were foiled; and it was only when the king's army broke up from sheer weariness that Parma withdrew unharmed to the north.

824. England was watching the struggle of Henry the Fourth with a keen interest. The failure of the expedition against Lisbon had put an end for the time to any direct attacks upon Spain, and the exhaustion of the treasury forced Elizabeth to content herself with issuing commissions to volunteers. But the war was a national one, and the nation waged it

for itself. Merchants, gentlemen, nobles, fitted out privateers. The sea-dogs in ever-growing numbers scoured the Spanish main. Their quest had its ill chances as it had its good, and sometimes the prizes made were far from paying for the cost of the venture. "Paul might plant and Apollos might water," John Hawkins explained after an unsuccessful voyage, "but it is God only that giveth the increase!" But more often the profit was enormous. Spanish galleons, Spanish merchant ships, were brought month after month to English harbors. The daring of the English seamen faced any odds. Ten English trading vessels beat off twelve Spanish war galleys in the Straits of Gibraltar. Sir Richard Grenville in a single bark, the *Revenge*, found himself girt in by fifty men-of-war, each twice as large as his own. He held out from afternoon to the following daybreak, beating off attempt after attempt to board him; and it was not till his powder was spent, more than half his crew killed, and the rest wounded, that the ship struck its flag. Grenville had refused to surrender, and was carried mortally wounded to die in a Spanish ship. "Here die I, Richard Grenville," were his last words, "with a joyful and a quiet mind, for that I have ended my life as a good soldier ought to do, who has fought for his country and his queen, for honor and religion." But the drift of the French war soon forced Elizabeth back again into the strife. In each of the French provinces the civil war went on; and in Brittany, where the contest raged fiercest, Philip sent the leaguers a supply of Spanish troops.

Normandy was already in Catholic hands, and the aim of the Spanish king was to secure the western coast for future operations against England. Elizabeth pressed Henry the Fourth to foil these projects, and in the winter of 1591 she sent money and men to aid him in the siege of Rouen.

825. To save Rouen, Philip was again forced to interrupt his work of conquest in the Netherlands. Parma marched anew into the heart of France, and with the same consummate generalship as of old relieved the town without giving Henry a chance of battle. But the day was fast going against the leaguers. The death of their puppet-king, Charles the Tenth, left them without a sovereign to oppose to Henry of Navarre; and their scheme of conferring the crown on Isabella, Philip's daughter by Elizabeth of France, with a husband whom Philip should choose, awoke jealousies in the house of Guise itself, while it gave strength to the national party, who shrank from laying France at the feet of Spain. Even the parliament of Paris, till now the center of Catholic fanaticism, protested against setting the crown of France on the brow of a stranger. The politicians drew closer to Henry of Navarre, and the moderate Catholics pressed for his reconciliation to the church as a means of restoring unity to the realm. The step had become so inevitable that even the Protestants were satisfied with Henry's promise of toleration; and in the summer of 1593 he declared himself a Catholic. With his conversion the civil war came practically to an end. It was in vain that Philip strove to maintain the zeal of the leaguers, or

that the Guises stubbornly kept the field. All France drew steadily to the king. Paris opened her gates in the spring of 1594, and the chief of the leaguers, the Duke of Mayenne, submitted at the close of the year. Even Rome abandoned the contest, and at the end of 1595 Henry received solemn absolution from Clement the Eighth. From that moment France rose again into her old power, and the old national policy of opposition to the house of Austria threw her weight into the wavering balance of Philip's fortunes. The death of Parma had already lightened the peril of the United Provinces, but though their struggle in the Low Countries was to last for years, from the moment of Henry the Fourth's conversion their independence was secure. Nor was the restoration of the French monarchy to its old greatness of less moment to England. Philip was yet to send an armada against her coasts; he was again to stir up a fierce revolt in northern Ireland. But all danger from Spain was over with the revival of France. Even were England to shrink from a strife in which she had held Philip so gloriously at bay, French policy would never suffer the island to fall unaided under the power of Spain. The fear of foreign conquest passed away. The long struggle for sheer existence was over. What remained was the Protestantism, the national union, the lofty patriotism, the pride in England and the might of Englishmen, which had drawn life more vivid and intense than they had ever known before from the long battle with the papacy and with Spain.

CHAPTER VII.

THE ENGLAND OF SHAKESPEARE.

1598—1608.

826. THE defeat of the Armada, the deliverance from Catholicism and Spain, marked the critical moment in our political development. From that hour England's destiny was fixed. She was to be a Protestant power. Her sphere of action was to be upon the seas. She was to claim her part in the new world of the west. But the moment was as critical in her intellectual development. As yet English literature had lagged behind the literature of the rest of western Christendom. It was now to take its place among the greatest literatures of the world. The general awakening of national life, the increase of wealth, of refinement, and leisure that characterized the reign of Elizabeth, was accompanied by a quickening of intelligence. The renaissance had done little for English letters. The overpowering influence of the new models both of thought and style which it gave to the world in the writers of Greece and Rome was at first felt only as a fresh check to the revival of English poetry or prose. Though England shared more than any European country in the political and ecclesiastical results of the new learning, its literary results were far less than in the rest of Europe, in Italy, or Germany, or France. More alone ranks among the great classical scholars of the sixteenth century. Classical learning,

indeed, all but perished at the universities in the storm of the reformation, nor did it revive there till the close of Elizabeth's reign. Insensibly, however, the influences of the renaissance fertilized the intellectual soil of England for the rich harvest that was to come. The court poetry which clustered round Wyatt and Surrey, exotic and imitative as it was, promised a new life for English verse. The growth of grammar schools realized the dream of Sir Thomas More, and brought the middle classes, from the squire to the petty tradesman, into contact with the masters of Greece and Rome. The love of travel, which became so remarkable a characteristic of Elizabeth's age, quickened the temper of the wealthier nobles. "Home-keeping youths," says Shakespeare, in words that mark the time, "have ever homely wits;" and a tour over the continent became part of the education of a gentleman. Fairfax's version of Tasso, Harrington's version of Ariosto, were signs of the influence which the literature of Italy, the land to which travel led most frequently, exerted on English minds. The classical writers told upon England at large when they were popularized by a crowd of translations. Chapman's noble version of Homer stands high above its fellows, but all the greater poets and historians of the ancient world were turned into English before the close of the sixteenth century.

827. It is characteristic of England that the first kind of literature to rise from its long death was the literature of history. But the form in which it rose marked the difference between the world in which

it had perished and that in which it re-appeared. During the Middle Ages the world had been without a past, save the shadowy and unknown past of early Rome; and annalist and chronicler told the story of the years which went before as a preface to their tale of the present without a sense of any difference between them. But the religious, social, and political change which passed over England under the new monarchy broke the continuity of its life; and the depth of the rift between the two ages is seen by the way in which history passes on its revival under Elizabeth from the mediæval form of pure narrative to its modern form of an investigation and reconstruction of the past. The new interest which attached to the by-gone world led to the collection of its annals, their reprinting and embodiment in an English shape. It was his desire to give the Elizabethan church a basis in the past, as much as any pure zeal for letters, which induced Archbishop Parker to lead the way in the first of these labors. The collection of historical manuscripts which, following in the track of Leland, he rescued from the wreck of the monastic libraries created a school of antiquarian imitators, whose research and industry have preserved for us almost every work of permanent historical value which existed before the dissolution of the monasteries. To his publication of some of our early chronicles we owe the series of similar publications which bear the name of Camden, Twysden, and Gale. But as a branch of literature, English history in the new shape which we have noted began in the work of the poet Daniel.

The chronicles of Stowe and Speed, who preceded him, are simple records of the past, often copied almost literally from the annals they used, and utterly without style or arrangement; while Daniel, inaccurate and superficial as he is, gave his story a literary form and embodied it in a pure and graceful prose. Two larger works at the close of Elizabeth's reign, the "History of the Turks," by Knolles, and Raleigh's vast but unfinished plan of the "History of the World," showed a widening of historic interest beyond the merely national bounds to which it had hitherto been confined.

828. A far higher development of our literature sprang from the growing influence which Italy was exerting, partly through travel and partly through its poetry and romances, on the manners and tastes of the time. Men made more account of a story of Boccaccio's, it was said, than of a story from the Bible. The dress, the speech, the manners of Italy, became objects of almost passionate imitation, and of an imitation not always of the wisest or noblest kind. To Ascham it seemed like "the enchantment of Circe brought out of Italy to mar men's manners in England." "An Italianate Englishman," ran the harder proverb of Italy itself, "is an incarnate devil." The literary form which this imitation took seemed, at any rate, ridiculous. John Lyly, distinguished both as a dramatist and a poet, laid aside the tradition of English style for a style modeled on the decadence of Italian prose. Euphuism, as the new fashion has been named, from the prose romance of Euphues which Lyly published in 1579,

is best known to modern readers by the pitiless caricature in which Shakespeare quizzed its pedantry, its affectation, the meaningless monotony of its far-fetched phrases, the absurdity of its extravagant conceits. Its representative, Armado in "*Love's Labour's Lost*," is "a man of fire-new words, fashion's own knight," "that hath a mint of phrases in his brain; one whom the music of his own vain tongue doth ravish like enchanting harmony." But its very extravagance sprang from the general burst of delight in the new resources of thought and language which literature felt to be at its disposal; and the new sense of literary beauty which it disclosed in its affectation, in its love of a "mint of phrases," and the "music of its ever vain tongue," the new sense of pleasure which it revealed in delicacy or grandeur of expression, in the structure and arrangement of sentences, in what has been termed the atmosphere of words, was a sense out of which style was itself to spring.

829. For a time euphuism had it all its own way. Elizabeth was the most affected and detestable of euphuists; and "that beauty in court which could not parley euphuism," a courtier of Charles the First's time tells us, "was as little regarded as she that now there speaks not French." The fashion, however, passed away, but the "*Arcadia*" of Sir Philip Sidney shows the wonderful advance which prose had made under its influence. Sidney, the nephew of Lord Leicester, was the idol of his time, and perhaps no figure reflects the age more fully and more beautifully. Fair as he was brave, quick of wit as of

affection, noble and generous in temper, dear to Elizabeth as to Spenser, the darling of the court and of the camp, his learning and his genius made him the center of the literary world which was springing into birth on English soil. He had traveled in France and Italy; he was master alike of the older learning and of the new discoveries of astronomy. Bruno dedicated to him as to a friend his metaphysical speculations; he was familiar with the drama of Spain, the poems of Ronsard, the sonnets of Italy. Sidney combined the wisdom of a grave councilor with the romantic chivalry of a knight-errant. "I never heard the old story of Percy and Douglas," he says, "that I found not my heart moved more than with a trumpet." He flung away his life to save the English army in Flanders, and as he lay dying they brought a cup of water to his fevered lips. He bade them give it to a soldier who was stretched on the ground beside him. "Thy necessity," he said, "is greater than mine." The whole of Sidney's nature, his chivalry and his learning, his thirst for adventures, his freshness of tone, his tenderness and child-like simplicity of heart, his affectation and false sentiment, his keen sense of pleasure and delight, pours itself out in the pastoral medley, forced, tedious, and yet strangely beautiful, of his "*Arcadia*." In his "*Defense of Poetry*," the youthful exuberance of the romancer has passed into the earnest vigor and grandiose stateliness of the rhetorician. But whether in one work or the other, the flexibility, the music, the luminous clearness of Sidney's style, remains the same.

880. But the quickness and vivacity of English prose was first developed in a school of Italian imitators which appeared in Elizabeth's later years. The origin of English fiction is to be found in the tales and romances with which Greene and Nash crowded the market, models for which they found in the Italian novels. The brief form of these novelettes soon led to the appearance of the "pamphlet;" and a new world of readers was seen in the rapidity with which the stories or scurrilous libels that passed under this name were issued, and the greediness with which they were devoured. It was the boast of Greene that in the eight years before his death he had produced forty pamphlets. "In a night or a day would he have yarked up a pamphlet, as well as in seven years, and glad was that printer that might be blest to pay him dear for the very dregs of his wit." Modern eyes see less of the wit than of the dregs in the books of Greene and his compeers; but the attacks which Nash directed against the Puritans and his rivals were the first English works which shook utterly off the pedantry and extravagance of euphuism. In his lightness, his facility, his vivacity, his directness of speech, we have the beginning of popular literature. It had descended from the closet to the street, and the very change implied that the street was ready to receive it. The abundance, indeed, of printers and of printed books at the close of the queen's reign shows that the world of readers and writers had widened far beyond the small circle of scholars and courtiers with which it began.

881. But to the national and local influences which

were telling on English literature was added that of the restlessness and curiosity which characterized the age. At the moment which we have reached, the sphere of human interest was widened as it has never been widened before or since by the revelation of a new heaven and a new earth. It was only in the later years of the sixteenth century that the discoveries of Copernicus were brought home to the general intelligence of mankind by Kepler and Galileo, or that the daring of the buccaneers broke through the vail which greed of Spain had drawn across the new world of Columbus. Hardly inferior to these revelations as a source of intellectual impulse was the sudden and picturesque way in which the various races of the world were brought face to face with one another through the universal passion for foreign travel. While the red tribes of the west were described by Amerigo Vespucci, and the strange civilization of Mexico and Peru disclosed by Cortes and Pizarro, the voyages of the Portuguese threw open the older splendors of the east, and the story of India and China was told for the first time to Christendom by Maffei and Mendoza. England took her full part in this work of discovery. Jenkinson, an English traveler, made his way to Bokhara. Willoughby brought back Muscovy to the knowledge of western Europe, English mariners penetrated among the Esquimaux, or settled in Virginia. Drake circumnavigated the globe. The "Collection of Voyages," which was published by Hakluyt in 1582, disclosed the vastness of the world

itself, the infinite number of the races of mankind, the variety of their laws, their customs, their religions, their very instincts. We see the influence of this new and wider knowledge of the world, not only in the life and richness which it gave to the imagination of the time, but in the immense interest which from this moment attached itself to man. Shakespeare's conception of Caliban, like the questioning of Montaigne, marks the beginning of a new and a truer, because a more inductive, philosophy of human nature and human history. The fascination exercised by the study of human character showed itself in the essays of Bacon, and yet more in the wonderful popularity of the drama.

832. And to these larger and world-wide sources of poetic power was added in England, at the moment which we have reached in its story, the impulse which sprang from national triumph, from the victory over the Armada, the deliverance from Spain, the rolling away of the Catholic terror which had hung like a cloud over the hopes of the new people. With its new sense of security, its new sense of national energy and national power, the whole aspect of England suddenly changed. As yet the interest of Elizabeth's reign had been political and material; the stage had been crowded with statesmen and warriors, with Cecils and Walsinghams and Drakes. Literature had hardly found a place in the glories of the time. But from the moment when the Armada drifted back, broken, to Ferrol the figures of warriors and statesmen were dwarfed by the grander figures of poets and philosophers. Amid the throng

in Elizabeth's antechamber the noblest form is that of the singer who lays the "Faerie Queen" at her feet, or of the young lawyer who muses amid the splendors of the presence over the problems of the "Novum Organum." The triumph at Cadiz, the conquest of Ireland, pass unheeded as we watch Hooker building up his "Ecclesiastical Polity" among the sheep-folds, or the genius of Shakespeare rising year by year into supreamer grandeur in a rude theater beside the Thames.

833. The glory of the new literature broke on England with Edmund Spenser. We know little of his life; he was born in 1552 in East London, the son of poor parents, but linked in blood with the Spencers of Althorpe, even then—as he proudly says—"a house of ancient fame." He studied as a sizar at Cambridge, and quitted the university while still a boy to live as a tutor in the north; but after some years of obscure poverty the scorn of a fair "Rosalind" drove him again southward. A college friendship with Gabriel Harvey served to introduce him to Lord Leicester, who sent him as his envoy into France, and in whose service he first became acquainted with Leicester's nephew, Sir Philip Sidney. From Sidney's house at Penshurst came in 1579 his earliest work, the "Shepherd's Calendar," in form like Sidney's own "Arcadia," a pastoral where love and loyalty and Puritanism jostled oddly with the fancied shepherd life. The peculiar melody and profuse imagination which the pastoral disclosed at once placed its author in the forefront of living poets, but a far greater work was already in hand;

and from some words of Gabriel Harvey's we see Spenser bent on rivaling Ariosto, and even hoping "to overgo" the "*Orlando Furioso*" in his "*Elfish Queen*." The ill-will or the indifference of Burleigh, however, blasted the expectations he had drawn from the patronage of Sidney or Leicester, and from the favor with which he had been welcomed by the queen. Sidney, in disgrace with Elizabeth through his opposition to the marriage with Anjou, withdrew to Wilton to write the "*Arcadia*" by his sister's side; and "discontent of my long fruitless stay in princes' courts," the poet tells us, "and expectation vain of idle hopes" drove Spenser into exile. In 1580 he followed Lord Grey as his secretary into Ireland and remained there on the deputy's recall in the enjoyment of an office and a grant of land from the forfeited estates of the Earl of Desmond. Spenser had thus enrolled himself among the colonists to whom England was looking at the time for the regeneration of Munster, and the practical interest he took in the "barren soil where cold and want and poverty do grow" was shown by the later publication of a prose tractate on the condition and government of the island. It was at Dublin or in his castle of Kilcolman, two miles from Doneraile, "under the foot of Mole, that mountain hoar," that he spent the ten years in which Sidney died and Mary fell on the scaffold and the Armada came and went; and it was in the latter home that Walter Raleigh found him sitting "alwaies idle," as it seemed to his restless friend, "among the cool shades of the green alders by the Mulla's shore" in a visit made memor-

able by the poem of "Colin Clout's come home again."

884. But in the "idlesse" and solitude of the poet's exile the great work begun in the two pleasant years of his stay at Penshurst had at last taken form, and it was to publish the first three books of the "Faerie Queen" that Spenser returned in Raleigh's company to London. The appearance of the "Faerie Queen" in 1590 is the one critical event in the annals of English poetry; it settled in fact the question whether there was to be such a thing as English poetry or no. The older national voice which had blossomed and died in Caedmon sprang suddenly into a grander life in Chaucer, but it closed again in a yet more complete death. Across the border, indeed, the Scotch poets of the fifteenth century preserved something of their master's vivacity and color, and in England itself the Italian poetry of the renaissance had of late found echoes in Surrey and Sidney. The new English drama, too, was beginning to display its wonderful powers, and the work of Marlowe had already prepared the way for the work of Shakespeare. But bright as was the promise of coming song, no great imaginative poem had broken the silence of English literature for nearly two hundred years when Spenser landed at Bristol with the "Faerie Queen." From that moment the stream of English poetry has flowed on without a break. There have been times, as in the years which immediately followed, when England has "become a nest of singing birds;" there have been times when song was scant and poor; but there never

has been a time when England was wholly without a singer.

835. The new English verse has been true to the source from which it sprang, and Spenser has always been "the poet's poet." But in his own day he was the poet of England at large. The "*Faerie Queen*" was received with a burst of general welcome. It became "the delight of every accomplished gentleman, the model of every poet, the solace of every soldier." The poem expressed, indeed, the very life of the time. It was with a true poetic instinct that Spenser fell back for the framework of his story on the fairy world of Celtic romance, whose wonder and mystery had in fact become the truest picture of the wonder and mystery of the world around him. In the age of Cortes and of Raleigh dreamland had ceased to be dreamland, and no marvel or adventure that befell lady or knight was stranger than the tales which weather-beaten mariners from the southern seas were telling every day to grave merchants upon 'change. The very incongruities of the story of Arthur and his knighthood, strangely as it had been built up out of the rival efforts of bard and jongleur and priest, made it the fittest vehicle for the expression of the world of incongruous feeling which we call the renaissance. To modern eyes, perhaps, there is something grotesque in the strange medley of figures that crowd the canvas of the "*Faerie Queen*;" in its fauns dancing on the sward where knights have hurtled together; in its alternation of the savage-men from the New World with the satyrs of classic mythology; in the giants, dwarfs, and monsters of

popular fancy who jostle with the nymphs of Greek legend and the damosels of medieval romance. But, strange as the medley is, it reflects truly enough the stranger medley of warring ideals and irreconcilable impulses which made up the life of Spenser's contemporaries. It was not in the "*Faerie Queen*" only, but in the world which it portrayed, that the religious mysticism of the Middle Ages stood face to face with the intellectual freedom of the revival of letters, that asceticism and self-denial cast their spell on imaginations glowing with the sense of varied and inexhaustible existence, that the dreamy and poetic refinement of feeling which expressed itself in the fanciful unrealities of chivalry co-existed with the rough practical energy that sprang from an awakening sense of human power, or the lawless extravagance of an idealized friendship and love lived side by side with the moral sternness and elevation which England was drawing from the reformation and the Bible.

886. But strangely contrasted as are the elements of the poem, they are harmonized by the calmness and serenity which is the note of the "*Faerie Queen*." The world of the renaissance is around us, but it is ordered, refined, and calmed by the poet's touch. The warmest scenes which he borrows from the Italian verse of his day are idealized into purity; the very struggle of the men around him is lifted out of his pettier accidents and raised into a spiritual oneness with the struggle in the soul itself. There are allusions in plenty to contemporary events, but the contest between Elizabeth and Mary takes ideal form

in that of Una and the false Duessa, and the clash of arms between Spain and the Huguenots comes to us faint and hushed through the serener air. The verse, like the story, rolls on as by its own natural power, without haste or effort or delay. The gorgeous coloring, the profuse and often complex imagery which Spenser's imagination lavishes, leave no sense of confusion in the reader's mind. Every figure, strange as it may be, is seen clearly and distinctly as it passes by. It is in this calmness, this serenity, this spiritual elevation of the "Faerie Queen," that we feel the new life of the coming age molding into ordered and harmonious form the life of the renaissance. Both in its conception, and in the way in which this conception is realized in the portion of his work which Spenser completed, his poem strikes the note of the coming Puritanism. In his earlier pastoral, the "Shepherd's Calendar," the poet had boldly taken his part with the more advanced reformers against the church policy of the court. He had chosen Archbishop Grindal, who was then in disgrace for his Puritan sympathies, as his model of a Christian pastor; and attacked with sharp invective the pomp of the higher clergy. His "Faerie Queen," in its religious theory, is Puritan to the core. The worst foe of its "Red-cross Knight" is the false and scarlet-clad Duessa of Rome, who parts him for a while from Truth and leads him to the house of Ignorance. Spenser presses strongly and pitilessly for the execution of Mary Stuart. No bitter word ever breaks the calm of his verse save when it touches on the perils with which Catholicism

was environing England, perils before which his knight must fall "were not that Heavenly Grace doth him uphold and steadfast Truth acquite him out of all." But it is yet more in the temper and aim of his work that we catch the nobler and deeper tones of English Puritanism. In his earlier musings at Penshurst the poet had purposed to surpass Ariosto, but the gayety of Ariosto's song is utterly absent from his own. Not a ripple of laughter breaks the calm surface of Spenser's verse. He is habitually serious, and the seriousness of his poetic tone reflects the seriousness of his poetic purpose. His aim, he tells us, was to represent the moral virtues, to assign to each its knightly patron, so that its excellence might be expressed and its contrary vice trodden under foot by deeds of arms and chivalry. In knight after knight of the twelve he purposed to paint, he wished to embody some single virtue of the virtuous man in its struggle with the faults and errors which specially beset it; till in Arthur, the sum of the whole company, man might have been seen perfected, in his longing and progress toward the "Faerie Queen," the divine glory which is the true end of human effort.

887. The largeness of his culture, indeed, his exquisite sense of beauty, and above all the very intensity of his moral enthusiasm, saved Spenser from the narrowness and exaggeration which often distorted goodness into unloveliness in the Puritan. Christian as he is to the core, his Christianity is enriched and fertilized by the larger temper of the renaissance, as well as by a poet's love of the natural world in which the older mythologies struck their

roots. Diana and the gods of heathendom take a sacred tinge from the purer sanctities of the new faith; and in one of the greatest songs of the "Faerie Queen" the conception of love widens, as it widened in the mind of a Greek, into the mighty thought of the productive energy of Nature. Spenser borrows, in fact, the delicate and refined forms of the Platonist philosophy to express his own moral enthusiasm. Not only does he love, as others have loved, all that is noble and pure and of good report, but he is fired as none before or after him have been fired with a passionate sense of moral beauty. Justice, Temperance, Truth are no mere names to him, but real existences to which his whole nature clings with a rapturous affection. Outer beauty he believed to spring, and loved because it sprang from the beauty of the soul within. There was much in such a moral protest as this to rouse dislike in any age, but it is the glory of the age of Elizabeth that, "mad world" as in many ways it was, all that was noble welcomed the "Faerie Queen." Elizabeth herself, says Spenser, "to mine oaten pipe inclined her ear," and bestowed a pension on the poet. In 1595 he brought three more books of his poem to England. He returned to Ireland to commemorate his marriage in sonnets and the most beautiful of bridal songs, and to complete the "Faerie Queen" among love and poverty and troubles from his Irish neighbors. But these troubles soon took a graver form. In 1599 Ireland broke into revolt, and the poet escaped from his burning house to fly to England and to die broken-hearted in an inn at Westminster.

838. If the "Faerie Queen" expressed the higher elements of the Elizabethan age, the whole of that age, its lower elements and its higher alike, was expressed in the English drama. We have already pointed out the circumstances which throughout Europe were giving a poetic impulse to the newly aroused intelligence of men, and this impulse everywhere took a dramatic shape. The artificial French tragedy which began about this time with Garnier was not, indeed, destined to exert any influence over English poetry till a later age; but the influence of the Italian comedy, which had begun half a century earlier with Machiavelli and Ariosto, was felt directly through the novels, or stories, which served as plots for our dramatists. It left its stamp, indeed, on some of the worst characteristics of the English stage. The features of our drama that startled the moral temper of the time and won the deadly hatred of the Puritans—its grossness and profanity, its tendency to scenes of horror and crime, its profuse employment of cruelty and lust as grounds of dramatic action, its daring use of the horrible and the unnatural whenever they enable it to display the more terrible and revolting sides of human passion—were derived from the Italian stage. It is doubtful how much the English playwrights may have owed to the Spanish drama, which under Lope and Cervantes sprang suddenly into a grandeur that almost rivaled their own. In the intermixture of tragedy and comedy, in the abandonment of the solemn uniformity of poetic diction for the colloquial language of real life, the use of unexpected incidents, the com-

plication of their plots and intrigues, the dramas of England and Spain are remarkably alike; but the likeness seems rather to have sprung from a similarity in the circumstances to which both owed their rise than to any direct connection of the one with the other. The real origin of the English drama, in fact, lay not in any influence from without but in the influence of England itself. The temper of the nation was dramatic. Ever since the reformation, the palace, the inns of court, and the university had been vying with one another in the production of plays; and so early was their popularity that even under Henry the Eighth it was found necessary to create "a master of the revels" to supervise them. Every progress of Elizabeth from shire to shire was a succession of shows and interludes. Dian with her nymphs met the queen as she returned from hunting; Love presented her with his golden arrow as she passed through the gates of Norwich. From the earlier years of her reign the new spirit of the renaissance had been pouring itself into the rough mold of the mystery plays, whose allegorical virtues and vices, or scriptural heroes and heroines, had handed on the spirit of the drama through the Middle Ages. Adaptations from classical pieces began to alternate with the purely religious "moralities;" and an attempt at a livelier style of expression and invention appeared in the popular comedy of "Grammar Gorton's Needle;" while Sackville, Lord Dorset, in his tragedy of "Gorboduc" made a bold effort at sublimity of diction, and introduced the use of blank verse as the vehicle of dramatic dialogue.

839. But it was not to these tentative efforts of scholars and nobles that the English stage was really indebted for the amazing outburst of genius which dates from the year 1576, when "the Earl of Leicester's servants" erected the first public theater in Blackfriars. It was the people itself that created its stage. The theater, indeed, was commonly only the court-yard of an inn, or a mere booth, such as is still seen in a country fair. The bulk of the audience sat beneath the open sky in the "pit" or yard; a few covered seats in the galleries which ran round it formed the boxes of the wealthier spectators, while patrons and nobles found seats upon the actual boards. All the appliances were of the roughest sort; a few flowers served to indicate a garden, crowds and armies were represented by a dozen scene-shifters with swords and bucklers, heroes rode in and out on hobby-horses, and a scroll on a post told whether the scene was at Athens or London. There were no female actors, and the grossness which startles us in words which fell from women's lips took a different color when every woman's part was acted by a boy. But difficulties such as these were more than compensated by the popular character of the drama itself. Rude as the theater might be, all the world was there. The stage was crowded with nobles and courtiers. Apprentices and citizens thronged the benches in the yard below. The rough mob of the pit inspired, as it felt, the vigorous life, the rapid transitions, the passionate energy, the reality, the life-like medley and confusion, the racy dialogue, the chat, the wit, the pathos, the sublimity,

the rant and buffoonery, the coarse horrors and vulgar blood-shedding, the immense range over all classes of society, the intimacy with the foulest as well as the fairest developments of human temper, which characterized the English stage. The new drama represented "the very age and body of the time, his form and pressure." The people itself brought its nobleness and its vileness to the boards. No stage was ever so human, no poetic life so intense. Wild, reckless, defiant of all past tradition, of all conventional laws, the English dramatists owned no teacher, no source of poetic inspiration, but the people itself.

840. Few events in our literary history are so startling as this sudden rise of the Elizabethan drama. The first public theater was erected only in the middle of the queen's reign. Before the close of it eighteen theaters existed in London alone. Fifty dramatic poets, many of the first order, appeared in the fifty years which precede the closing of the theaters by the Puritans; and great as is the number of their works which have perished, we still possess a hundred dramas, all written within this period, and of which at least a half are excellent. A glance at their authors shows us that the intellectual quickening of the age had now reached the mass of the people. Almost all of the new playwrights were fairly educated, and many were university men. But instead of courtly singers of the Sidney and Spenser sort we see the advent of the "poor scholar." The earlier dramatists, such as Nash, Peele, Kyd, Greene, or Marlowe, were for the most part poor, and reck-

less in their poverty, wild livers, defiant of law or common fame, in revolt against the usages and religion of their day, "atheists" in general repute, "holding Moses for a juggler," haunting the brothel and the alehouse, and dying starved or in tavern brawls. But with their appearance began the Elizabethan drama. The few plays which have reached us of an earlier date are either cold imitations of the classical and Italian comedy, or rude farces like "Ralph Roister Doister," or tragedies such as "Gorbuduc," where, poetic as occasional passages may be, there is little promise of dramatic development. But in the year which preceded the coming of the Armada, the whole aspect of the stage suddenly changes, and the new dramatists range themselves around two men of very different genius, Robert Greene and Christopher Marlowe.

841. Of Greene, as the creator of our lighter English prose, we have already spoken. But his work as a poet was of yet greater importance, for his perception of character and the relations of social life, the playfulness of his fancy, and the liveliness of his style, exerted an influence on his contemporaries which was equaled by that of none but Marlowe and Peele. In spite of the rudeness of his plots and the unequal character of his work, Greene must be regarded as the creator of our modern comedy. No figure better paints the group of young playwrights. He left Cambridge to travel through Italy and Spain, and to bring back the debauchery of the one and the skepticism of the other. In the words of remorse he wrote before his death; he paints himself as a drunk-

ard and a roysterer, winning money only by ceaseless pamphlets and plays to waste it on wine and women, and drinking the cup of life to the dregs. Hell and the after-world were the butts of his ceaseless mockery. If he had not feared the judges of the queen's courts more than he feared God, he said, in bitter jest, he should often have turned cut-purse. He married, and loved his wife, but she was soon deserted; and the wretched profligate found himself again plunged into excesses which he loathed, though he could not live without them. But wild as was the life of Greene, his pen was pure. He is steadily on virtue's side in the love-pamphlets and novelettes he poured out in endless succession, and whose plots were dramatized by the school which gathered round him.

842. The life of Marlowe was as riotous, his skepticism even more daring, than the life and skepticism of Greene. His early death alone saved him, in all probability, from a prosecution for atheism. He was charged with calling Moses a juggler, and with boasting that, if he undertook to write a new religion, it should be a better religion than the Christianity he saw around him. But he stood far ahead of his fellows as a creator of English tragedy. Born in 1564, at the opening of Elizabeth's reign, the son of a Canterbury shoemaker, but educated at Cambridge, Marlowe burst on the world in the year which preceded the triumph over the Armada with a play which at once wrought a revolution in the English stage. Bombastic and extravagant as it was—and extravagance reached its height in a scene

where captive kings, the "pampered jades of Asia," drew their conqueror's car across the stage—"Tamburlaine" not only indicated the revolt of the new drama against the timid inanities of euphuism, but gave an earnest of that imaginative daring, the secret of which Marlowe was to bequeath to the playwrights who followed him. He perished at thirty in a shameful brawl, but in his brief career he had struck the grander notes of the coming drama. His *Jew of Malta* was the herald of *Shylock*. He opened in "*Edward the Second*" the series of historical plays which gave us "*Cæsar*" and "*Richard the Third*." His "*Faustus*" is riotous, grotesque, and full of a mad thirst for pleasure, but it was the first dramatic attempt to touch the problem of the relations of man to the unseen world. Extravagant, unequal, stooping even to the ridiculous in his cumbersome and vulgar buffoonery, there is a force in Marlowe, a conscious grandeur of tone, a range of passion, which sets him above all his contemporaries save one. In the higher qualities of imagination, as in the majesty and sweetness of his "mighty line," he is inferior to Shakespeare alone.

843. A few daring jests, a brawl, and a fatal stab make up the life of Marlowe; but even details such as these are wanting to the life of William Shakespeare. Of hardly any great poet, indeed, do we know so little. For the story of his youth we have only one or two trifling legends, and these almost certainly false. Not a single letter or characteristic saying, not one of the jests "spoken at the Mermaid," hardly a single anecdote, remain to illustrate

his busy life in London. His look and figure in later age have been preserved by the bust over his tomb at Stratford, and a hundred years after his death he was still remembered in his native town; but the minute diligence of the inquirers of the Georgian time was able to glean hardly a single detail, even of the most trivial order, which could throw light upon the years of retirement before his death. It is owing, perhaps, to the harmony and unity of his temper that no salient peculiarity seems to have left its trace on the memory of his contemporaries; it is the very grandeur of his genius which precludes us from discovering any personal trait in his works. His supposed self-revelation in the sonnets is so obscure that only a few outlines can be traced even by the boldest conjecture. In his dramas he is all his characters, and his characters range over all mankind. There is not one, or the act or word of one, that we can identify personally with the poet himself.

844. He was born in 1564, the sixth year of Elizabeth's reign, twelve years after the birth of Spenser, three years later than the birth of Bacon. Marlowe was of the same age with Shakespeare; Greene probably a few years older. His father, a glover, and small farmer of Stratford-on-Avon, was forced by poverty to lay down his office of alderman as his son reached boyhood; and stress of poverty may have been the cause which drove William Shakespeare, who was already married at eighteen to a wife older than himself, to London and the stage. His life in the capital can hardly have begun later

than in his twenty-third year, the memorable year which followed Sidney's death, which preceded the coming of the Armada, and which witnessed the production of Marlowe's "Tamburlaine." If we take the language of the sonnets as a record of his personal feeling, his new profession as an actor stirred in him only the bitterness of self-contempt. He chides with fortune, "that did not better for my life provide than public means that public manners breed;" he writhes at the thought that he has "made himself a motley to the view" of the gaping apprentices in the pit of Blackfriars. "Thence comes it," he adds, "that my name receives a brand, and almost thence my nature is subdued to that it works in." But the application of the words is a more than doubtful one. In spite of petty squabbles with some of his dramatic rivals at the outset of his career, the genial nature of the new-comer seems to have won him a general love among his fellows. In 1592, while still a mere actor and fitter of old plays for the stage, a fellow-playwright, Chettle, answered Greene's attack on him in words of honest affection: "Myself have seen his demeanor no less civil than he excellent in the quality he professes; besides, divers of worship have reported his uprightness of dealing, which argues his honesty, and his facetious grace in writing, that approves his art." His partner, Burbage, spoke of him after death as a "worthy friend and fellow;" and Jonson handed down the general tradition of his time when he described him as "indeed honest, and of an open and free nature."

845. His profession as an actor was, at any rate, of essential service to him in the poetic career which he soon undertook. Not only did it give him the sense of theatrical necessities which makes his plays so effective on the boards, but it enabled him to bring his pieces, as he wrote them, to the test of the stage. If there is any truth in Jonson's statement that Shakespeare never blotted a line, there is no justice in the censure which it implies on his carelessness or incorrectness. The conditions of poetic publication were, in fact, wholly different from those of our own day. A drama remained for years in manuscript as an acting piece, subject to continual revision and amendment; and every rehearsal and representation afforded hints for change which we know the young poet was far from neglecting. The chance which has preserved an earlier edition of his "Hamlet" shows in what an unsparing way Shakespeare could recast even the finest products of his genius. Five years after the supposed date of his arrival in London he was already famous as a dramatist. Greene speaks bitterly of him, under the name of "Shakescene," as an "upstart crow beautiful with our feathers," a sneer which points either to his celebrity as an actor or to his preparation for loftier flights by fitting pieces of his predecessors for the stage. He was soon partner in the theater, actor, and playwright; and another nickname, that of "Johannes Factotum," or Jack-of-all-trades, shows his readiness to take all honest work which came to hand.

846. With his publication in 1593 of the poem of

"Venus and Adonis," "the first heir of my invention" as Shakespeare calls it, the period of independent creation fairly began. The date of its publication was a very memorable one. The "*Faerie Queen*" had appeared only three years before, and had placed Spenser without a rival at the head of English poetry. On the other hand, the two leading dramatists of the time passed at this moment suddenly away. Greene died in poverty and self-reproach in the house of a poor shoemaker. "Doll," he wrote, to the wife he had abandoned, "I charge thee by the love of our youth, and by my soul's rest, that thou wilt see this man paid; for if he and his wife had not succored me, I had died in the streets." "Oh, that a year were granted me to live," cried the young poet from his bed of death; "but I must die, of every man abhorred! Time, loosely spent, will not again be won! My time is loosely spent—and I undone!" A year later the death of Marlowe in a street brawl removed the only rival whose powers might have equaled Shakespeare's own. He was now about thirty; and the twenty-three years which elapsed between the appearance of the "*Adonis*" and his death were filled with a series of masterpieces. Nothing is more characteristic of his genius than its incessant activity. Through the five years which followed the publication of his early poem, he seems to have produced on an average two dramas a year. When we attempt, however, to trace the growth and progress of the poet's mind in the order of his plays, we are met in the case of many of them by an absence of certain information

as to the dates of their appearance. The facts on which inquiry has to build are extremely few. "Venus and Adonis," with the "Lucrece," must have been written before their publication in 1593-4; the sonnets, though not published till 1609, were known in some form among his private friends as early as 1598. His earlier plays are defined by a list given in the "Wit's Treasury" of Francis Meres, in 1598, though the omission of a play from a casual catalogue of this kind would hardly warrant us in assuming its necessary non-existence at the time. The works ascribed to him at his death are fixed in the same approximate fashion through the edition published by his fellow-actors. Beyond these meager facts and our knowledge of the publication of a few of his dramas in his lifetime, all is uncertain; and the conclusions which have been drawn from these, and from the dramas themselves, as well as from assumed resemblances with, or references to, other plays of the period, can only be accepted as approximations to the truth.

847. The bulk of his lighter comedies and historical dramas can be assigned with fair probability to a period from about 1593, when Shakespeare was known as nothing more than an adapter, to 1598, when they are mentioned in the list of Meres. They bear on them, indeed, the stamp of youth. In "Love's Labor's Lost," the young playwright, fresh from his own Stratford, its "daisies pied and violets blue," with the gay, bright music of its country ditties still in his ears, flings himself into the midst of the brilliant England which gathered round Elizabeth,

busying himself as yet for the most part with the surface of it, with the humors and quixotisms, the wit and the whim, the unreality, the fantastic extravagance, which veiled its inner nobleness. Country lad as he is, Shakespeare shows himself master of it all; he can patter euphuism and exchange quip and repartee with the best; he is at home in their pedantries and affectations, their brag and their rhetoric, their passion for the fantastic and the marvelous. He can laugh as heartily at the romantic vagaries of the courtly world in which he finds himself as at the narrow dullness, the pompous triflings, of the country world which he has left behind him. But he laughs frankly and without malice; he sees the real grandeur of soul which underlies all this quixotry and word-play; and owns, with a smile, that when brought face to face with the facts of human life, with the suffering of man or the danger of England, these fops have in them the stuff of heroes. He shares the delight in existence, the pleasure in sheer living, which was so marked a feature of the age; he enjoys the mistakes, the contrasts, the adventures of the men about him; his fun breaks almost riotously out in the practical jokes of the "Taming of the Shrew," and the endless blunderings of the "Comedy of Errors." In these earlier efforts his work had been marked by little poetic elevation or by passion. But the easy grace of the dialogue, the dexterous management of a complicated story, the genial gayety of his tone, and the music of his voice promised a master of social comedy as soon as Shakespeare turned from the superfi-

cial aspects of the world about him to find a new delight in the character and actions of men. The interest of human character was still fresh and vivid; the sense of individuality drew a charm from its novelty; and poet and essayist were busy alike in sketching the "humors" of mankind. Shakespeare sketched with his fellows. In the "Two Gentlemen of Verona," his painting of manners was suffused by a tenderness and ideal beauty which formed an effective protest against the hard though vigorous character-painting which the first success of Ben Jonson in "Every Man in his Humor" brought at the time into fashion. But quick on these lighter comedies followed two in which his genius started fully into life. His poetic power, held in reserve till now, showed itself with a splendid profusion in the brilliant fancies of the "Midsummer Night's Dream;" and passion swept like a tide of resistless delight through "Romeo and Juliet."

848. Side by side, however, with these passionate dreams, these delicate imaginings and piquant sketches of manners, had been appearing during this short interval of intense activity a series of dramas which mark Shakespeare's relation to the new sense of patriotism, the more vivid sense of national existence, national freedom, national greatness, which gives its grandeur to the age of Elizabeth. England itself was now becoming a source of literary interest to poet and prose-writer. Warner in his "Albion's England," Daniel in his "Civil Wars," embalmed in verse the record of her past;

Drayton in his "Polyolbion" sang the fairness of the land itself, the "tracts, mountains, forests, and other parts of this renowned isle of Britain." The national pride took its highest poetic form in the historical drama. No plays seem to have been more popular from the earliest hours of the new stage than dramatic representations of our history. Marlowe had shown in his "Edward the Second" what tragic grandeur could be reached in this favorite field; and, as we have seen, Shakespeare had been led naturally toward it by his earlier occupation as an adapter of stock pieces like "Henry the Sixth" for the new requirements of the stage. He still to some extent followed in plan the older plays on the subjects he selected, but in his treatment of their themes he shook boldly off the yoke of the past. A larger and deeper conception of human character than any of the old dramatists had reached displayed itself in Richard the Third, in Falstaff, or in Hotspur; while in Constance and Richard the Second the pathos of human suffering was painted as even Marlowe had never dared to paint it.

849. No dramas have done so much for Shakespeare's enduring popularity with his countrymen as these historical plays. They have done more than all the works of English historians to nourish in the minds of Englishmen a love of and reverence for their country's past. When Chatham was asked where he had read his English history he answered, "In the plays of Shakespeare." Nowhere could he have read it so well, for nowhere is the spirit of our history so nobly rendered. If the poet's work

echoes sometimes our national prejudice and unfairness of temper, it is instinct throughout with English humor, with our English love of hard fighting, our English faith in goodness and in the doom that waits upon triumphant evil, our English pity for the fallen. Shakespeare is Elizabethan to the core. He stood at the meeting-point of two great epochs of our history. The age of the renaissance was passing into the age of Puritanism. Rifts which were still little were widening every hour, and threatening ruin to the fabric of church and state which the Tudors had built up. A new political world was rising into being; a world healthier, more really national, but less picturesque, less wrapt in the mystery and splendor that poets love. Great as were the faults of Puritanism, it may fairly claim to be the first political system which recognized the grandeur of the people as a whole. As great a change was passing over the spiritual sympathies of men. A sterner Protestantism was invigorating and ennobling life by its morality, its seriousness, its intense conviction of God. But it was at the same time hardening and narrowing it. The Bible was superseding Plutarch. The "obstinate questionings" which haunted the finer souls of the renaissance were being stereotyped into the theological formulas of the Puritan. The sense of a divine omnipotence was annihilating man. The daring which turned England into a people of "adventurers," the sense of inexhaustible resources, the buoyant freshness of youth, the intoxicating sense of beauty and joy which created Sidney and Marlowe and

Drake, were passing away before the consciousness of evil and the craving to order man's life aright before God.

850. From this new world of thought and feeling Shakespeare stood aloof. Turn as others might to the speculations of theology, man and man's nature remained with him an inexhaustible subject of interest. Caliban was among his latest creations. It is impossible to discover whether his religious belief was Catholic or Protestant. It is hard, indeed, to say whether he had any religious belief or no. The religious phrases which are thinly scattered over his works are little more than expressions of a distant and imaginative reverence. But on the deeper grounds of religious faith his silence is significant. He is silent, and the doubt of Hamlet deepens his silence, about the after-world. "To die," it may be, was to him as it was to Claudio, "to go we know not whither." Often as his questionings turn to the riddle of life and death, he leaves it a riddle to the last without heeding the common theological solutions around him. "We are such stuff as dreams are made of, and our little life is rounded with a sleep."

851. Nor were the political sympathies of the poet those of the coming time. His roll of dramas is the epic of civil war. The wars of the Roses fill his mind, as they filled the mind of his contemporaries. It is not till we follow him through the series of plays from "Richard the Second" to "Henry the Eighth" that we realize how profoundly the memory of the struggle between York and Lancaster had

molded the temper of the people, how deep a dread of civil war, of baronial turbulence, of disputes over the succession to the throne, it had left behind it. Men had learned the horrors of the time from their fathers; they had drunk in with their childhood the lesson that such a chaos of weakness and misrule must never be risked again. From such a risk the crown seemed the one security. With Shakespeare as with his fellow-countrymen the crown is still the center and safeguard of the national life. His ideal England is an England grouped around a noble king, a king such as his own Henry the Fifth, devout, modest, simple as he is brave, but a lord in battle, a born ruler of men, with a loyal people about him and his enemies at his feet. Socially the poet reflects the aristocratic view of social life which was shared by all the nobler spirits of the Elizabethan time. Coriolanus is the embodiment of a great noble; and the taunts which Shakespeare hurls in play after play at the rabble only echo the general temper of the renaissance. But he shows no sympathy with the struggle of feudalism against the crown. If he paints Hotspur with a fire which proves how thoroughly he could sympathize with the rough, bold temper of the baronage, he suffers him to fall unpitied before Henry the Fourth. Apart, however, from the strength and justice of its rule, royalty has no charm for him. He knows nothing of the "right divine of kings to govern wrong" which became the doctrine of prelates and courtiers in the age of the Stuarts. He shows in his "Richard the Second" the doom that waits on a

lawless despotism, as he denounces in his "Richard the Third" the selfish and merciless ambition that severs a ruler from his people. But the dread of misrule was a dim and distant one. Shakespeare had grown up under the reign of Elizabeth; he had known no ruler save one who had cast a spell over the hearts of Englishmen. His thoughts were absorbed, as those of the country were absorbed, in the struggle for national existence which centered round the queen. "King John" is a trumpet-call to rally round Elizabeth in her fight for England. Again a pope was asserting his right to depose an English sovereign and to loose Englishmen from their bond of allegiance. Again political ambitions and civil discord woke at the call of religious war. Again a foreign power was threatening England at the summons of Rome, and hoping to master her with the aid of revolted Englishmen. The heat of such a struggle as this left no time for the thought of civil liberties. Shakespeare casts aside the thought of the charter to fix himself on the strife of the stranger for England itself. What he sang was the duty of patriotism, the grandeur of loyalty, the freedom of England from pope or Spaniard, its safety within its "water-walled bulwark," if only its national union was secure. And now that the nation was at one, now that he had seen in his first years of London life Catholics as well as Protestants trooping to the muster at Tilbury and hasting down Thames to the fight in the channel, he could thrill his hearers with the proud words that sum up the work of Elizabeth:

This England never did, nor never shall,  
Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror,  
But when it first did help to wound itself.  
Now that her princes are come home again,  
Come the three corners of the world in arms,  
And we shall shock them! Nought shall make us rue  
If England to itself do rest but true.

852. With this great series of historical and social dramas Shakespeare had passed far beyond his fellows, whether as a tragedian or as a writer of comedy. "The Muses," says Meres in 1598, "would speak with Shakespeare's fine-filed phrase, if they would speak English." His personal popularity was now at its height. His pleasant temper and the vivacity of his wit had drawn him early into contact with the young Earl of Southampton, to whom his "Adonis" and "Lucrece" are dedicated; and the different tone of the two dedications shows how rapidly acquaintance ripened into an ardent friendship. Shakespeare's wealth and influence, too, were growing fast. He had property both in Stratford and London, and his fellow-townsmen made him their suitor to Lord Burleigh for favors to be bestowed on Stratford. He was rich enough to aid his father, and to buy the house at Stratford which afterward became his home. The tradition that Elizabeth was so pleased with Falstaff in "Henry the Fourth" that she ordered the poet to show her Falstaff in love—an order which produced the "Merry Wives of Windsor"—whether true or false, proves his repute as a playwright. As the group of earlier poets passed away, they found successors in Marston, Dekker, Middle-

ton, Heywood, and Chapman, and above all in Ben Jonson. But none of these could dispute the supremacy of Shakespeare. The verdict of Meres that "Shakespeare among the English is the most excellent in both kinds for the stage," represented the general feeling of his contemporaries. He was at last fully master of the resources of his art. The "Merchant of Venice" marks the perfection of his development as a dramatist in the completeness of its stage effect, the ingenuity of its incidents, the ease of its movement, the beauty of its higher passages, the reserve and self-control with which its poetry is used, the conception and unfolding of character, and, above all, the mastery with which character and event are grouped round the figure of Shylock. Master as he is of his art, the poet's temper is still young; the "Merry Wives of Windsor," is a burst of gay laughter; and laughter more tempered, yet full of a sweeter fascination, rings round us in "As You Like It."

853. But in the melancholy and meditative Jaques of the last drama we feel the touch of a new and graver mood. Youth, so full and buoyant in the poet till now, seems to have passed almost suddenly away. Though Shakespeare had hardly reached forty, in one of his sonnets, which cannot have been written at a much later time than this, there are indications that he already felt the advance of premature age. And at this moment the outer world suddenly darkened around him. The brilliant circle of young nobles, whose friendship he had shared, was broken up in 1601 by the political storm which burst in a mad

struggle of the Earl of Essex for power. Essex himself fell on a scaffold; his friend and Shakespeare's idol, Southampton, passed a prisoner into the Tower; Herbert, Lord Pembroke, younger patron of the poet, was banished from the court. While friends were thus falling and hopes fading without, Shakespeare's own mind seems to have been going through a phase of bitter suffering and unrest. In spite of the ingenuity of commentators, it is difficult and even impossible to derive any knowledge of Shakespeare's inner history from the sonnets. "The strange imagery of passion which passes over the magic mirror," it has been finely said, "has no tangible evidence before or behind it." But its mere passing is itself an evidence of the restlessness and agony within. The change in the character of his dramas gives a surer indication of his change of mood. The fresh joyousness, the keen delight in life and in man, which breathes through Shakespeare's early work disappears in comedies such as "*Troilus*" and "*Measure for Measure*." Disappointment, disillusion, a new sense of the evil and foulness that underlies so much of human life, a loss of the old frank trust in its beauty and goodness, threw their gloom over these comedies. Failure seems everywhere. In "*Julius Cæsar*" the virtue of Brutus is foiled by its ignorance of and isolation from mankind; in *Hamlet* even penetrating intellect proves helpless for want of the capacity of action; the poison of Iago taints the love of Desdemona and the grandeur of Othello; Lear's mighty passion battles helplessly against the wind and the rain; a woman's weakness of frame

dashes the cup of her triumph from the hand of Lady Macbeth; lust and self-indulgence blast the heroism of Antony; pride ruins the nobleness of Coriolanus.

854. But the very struggle and self-introspection that these dramas betray were to give a depth and grandeur to Shakespeare's work such as it had never known before. The age was one in which man's temper and powers took a new range and energy. Sidney or Raleigh lived not one but a dozen lives at once; the daring of the adventurer, the philosophy of the scholar, the passion of the lover, the fanaticism of the saint, towered into almost superhuman grandeur. Man became conscious of the immense resources that lay within him, conscious of boundless powers that seemed to mock the narrow world in which he moved. All through the age of the renaissance one feels this impress of the gigantic, this giant-like activity, this immense ambition and desire. The very bombast and extravagance of the times reveal cravings and impulses before which common speech broke down. It is this grandeur of humanity that finds its poetic expression in the later work of Shakespeare. As the poet penetrated deeper and deeper into the recesses of the soul, he saw how great and wondrous a thing was man. "What a piece of work is a man!" cries Hamlet; "how noble in reason; how infinite in faculty; in form and moving how express and admirable; in action how like an angel; in apprehension how like a god; the beauty of the world; the paragon of animals!" It is the wonder of man that spreads before

us as the poet pictures the wide speculation of Hamlet, the awful convulsion of a great nature in Othello, the terrible storm in the soul of Lear which blends with the very storm of the heavens themselves, the awful ambition that nerved a woman's hand to dabble itself with the blood of a murdered king, the reckless lust that "flung away a world for love." Amid the terror and awe of these great dramas we learn something of the vast forces of the age from which they sprang. The passion of Mary Stuart, the ruthlessness of Alva, the daring of Drake, the chivalry of Sidney, the range of thought and action in Raleigh or Elizabeth, come better home to us as we follow the mighty series of tragedies which began in "Hamlet" and ended in "Coriolanus."

855. Shakespeare's last dramas, the three exquisite works in which he shows a soul at rest with itself and with the world, "Cymbeline," "The Tempest," "Winter's Tale," were written in the midst of ease and competence in a house at Stratford to which he withdrew a few years after the death of Elizabeth. In them we lose all relation with the world or the time, and pass into a region of pure poetry. It is in this peaceful and gracious close that the life of Shakespeare contrasts most vividly with that of his greatest contemporary. If the imaginative resources of the new England were seen in the creators of "Hamlet" and the "Faerie Queen," its purely intellectual capacity, its vast command over the stores of human knowledge, the amazing sense of its own powers with which it dealt with them, were seen in the work of Francis Bacon. Bacon was born in

1561, three years before the birth of Shakespeare. He was the younger son of a Lord Keeper, as well as the nephew of Lord Burleigh, and even in childhood his quickness and sagacity won the favor of the queen. Elizabeth "delighted much to confer with him, and to prove him with questions: unto which he delivered himself with that gravity and maturity above his years; that her majesty would often term him 'the young Lord Keeper.'" Even as a boy at college he expressed his dislike of the Aristotelian philosophy, as "a philosophy only strong for disputations and contentions, but barren of the production of works for the benefit of the life of man." As a law student of twenty-one, he sketched in a tract on the "Greatest Birth of Time" the system of inductive inquiry which he was already prepared to substitute for it. The speculations of the young thinker, however, were interrupted by his hopes of court success. But these were soon dashed to the ground. He was left poor by his father's death; the ill-will of the Cecils barred his advancement with the queen; and a few years before Shakespeare's arrival in London Bacon entered as a barrister at Gray's Inn. He soon became one of the most successful lawyers of the time. At twenty-three Bacon was a member of the house of commons, and his judgment and eloquence at once brought him to the front. "The fear of every man that heard him was lest he should make an end," Ben Jonson tells us. The steady growth of his reputation was quickened in 1597 by the appearance of his "Essays," a work remarkable, not merely for the condensation of its

thought and its felicity and exactness of expression, but for the power with which it applied to human life that experimental analysis which Bacon was at a later time to make the key of science.

856. His fame at once became great at home and abroad, but with this nobler fame Bacon could not content himself. He was conscious of great powers as well as great aims for the public good; and it was a time when such aims could hardly be realized, save through the means of the crown. But political employment seemed farther off than ever. At the outset of his career in parliament, he irritated Elizabeth by a firm opposition to her demand of a subsidy and though the offense was atoned for by profuse apologies, and by the cessation of all further resistance to the policy of the court, the law offices of the crown were more than once refused to him, and it was only after the publication of his "Essays" that he could obtain some slight promotion as a queen's counsel. The moral weakness which more and more disclosed itself is the best justification of the queen in her reluctance—a reluctance so greatly in contrast with her ordinary course—to bring the wisest head in her realm to her council-board. The men whom Elizabeth employed were, for the most part, men whose intellect was directed by a strong sense of public duty. Their reverence for the queen, strangely exaggerated as it may seem to us, was guided and controlled by an ardent patriotism and an earnest sense of religion; and with all their regard for the royal prerogative, they never lost their regard for the law. The grandeur and originality

of Bacon's intellect parted him from men like these quite as much as the bluntness of his moral perceptions. In politics, as in science, he had little reverence for the past. Law, constitutional privileges, or religion, were to him simply means of bringing about certain ends of good government; and if these ends could be brought about in shorter fashion he saw only pedantry in insisting on more cumbrous means. He had great social and political ideas to realize, the reform and codification of the law, the civilization of Ireland, the purification of the church, the union—at a later time—of Scotland and England, educational projects, projects of material improvement, and the like; and the direct and shortest way of realizing these ends was, in Bacon's eyes, the use of the power of the crown. But whatever charm such a conception of the royal power might have for her successor, it had little charm for Elizabeth; and to the end of her reign Bacon was foiled in his efforts to rise in her service.

857. Political activity, however, and court intrigue, left room in his mind for the philosophical speculation which had begun with his earliest years. Amid debates in parliament and flatteries in the closet, Bacon had been silently framing a new philosophy. It made its first decisive appearance after the final disappointment of his hopes from Elizabeth in the publication of the "Advancement of Learning." The close of this work was, in his own words, "a general and faithful perambulation of learning, with an inquiry what parts thereof lie fresh and waste, and not improved and converted by

the industry of man, to the end that such a plot, made and recorded to memory, may both minister light to any public designation and also serve to excite voluntary endeavors." It was only by such a survey, he held, that men could be turned from useless studies, or ineffectual means of pursuing more useful ones, and directed to the true end of knowledge as "a rich storehouse for the glory of the Creator and the relief of man's estate." The work was, in fact, the preface to a series of treatises which were intended to be built up into an "Instauratio Magna," which its author was never destined to complete, and of which the parts that we possess were published in the following reign. The "Cogitata et Visa" was a first sketch of the "Novum Organum," which, in its complete form, was presented to James in 1621. A year later Bacon produced his "Natural and Experimental History." This, with the "Novum Organum" and the "Advancement of Learning," was all of his projected "Instauratio Magna" which he actually finished; and even of this portion we have only part of the last two divisions. The "Ladder of the Understanding," which was to have followed these and led up from experience to science; the "Anticipations," or provisional hypothesis for the inquiries of the new philosophy; and the closing account of "Science in Practice," were left for posterity to bring to completion. "We may, as we trust," said Bacon, "make no despicable beginnings. The destinies of the human race must complete it, in such a manner perhaps as men looking only at the present

world would not readily conceive. For upon this will depend, not only a speculative good, but all the fortunes of mankind, and all their power."

858. When we turn from words like these to the actual work which Bacon did, it is hard not to feel a certain disappointment. He did not thoroughly understand the older philosophy which he attacked. His revolt from the waste of human intelligence which he conceived to be owing to the adoption of a false method of investigation, blinded him to the real value of deduction as an instrument of discovery; and he was encouraged in his contempt for it as much by his own ignorance of mathematics as by the non-existence in his day of the great deductive sciences of physics and astronomy. Nor had he a more accurate prevision of the method of modern science. The inductive process to which he exclusively directed men's attention bore no fruit in Bacon's hands. The "art of investigating nature," on which he prided himself, has proved useless for scientific purposes, and would be rejected by modern investigators. Where he was on a more correct track he can hardly be regarded as original. "It may be doubted," says Dugald Stewart, "whether any one important rule with regard to the true method of investigation be contained in his works of which no hint can be traced in those of his predecessors." Not only, indeed, did Bacon fail to anticipate the methods of modern science, but he even rejected the great scientific discoveries of his own day. He set aside with the same scorn the astronomical theory of Copernicus and the magnetic

investigations of Gilbert. The contempt seems to have been fully returned by the scientific workers of his day. "The lord chancellor wrote on science," said Harvey, the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, "like a lord chancellor."

859. In spite, however, of his inadequate appreciation either of the old philosophy or the new, the almost unanimous voice of later ages has attributed, and justly attributed, to the "*Novum Organum*" a decisive influence on the development of modern science. If he failed in revealing the method of experimental research, Bacon was the first to proclaim the existence of a philosophy of science, to insist on the unity of knowledge and inquiry throughout the physical world, to give dignity by the large and noble temper in which he treated them to the petty details of experiment in which science had to begin, to clear a way for it by setting scornfully aside the traditions of the past, to claim for it its true rank and value, and to point to the enormous results which its culture would bring in increasing the power and happiness of mankind. In one respect his attitude was in the highest degree significant. The age in which he lived was one in which theology was absorbing the intellectual energy of the world. He was the servant, too, of a king with whom theological studies superseded all others. But if he bowed in all else to James, Bacon would not, like Casaubon, bow in this. He would not even, like Descartes, attempt to transform theology by turning reason into a mode of theological demonstration. He stood absolutely aloof from it. Though as a politician he did

not shrink from dealing with such subjects as church reform, he dealt with them simply as matters of civil polity. But from his exhaustive enumeration of the branches of human knowledge he excluded theology, and theology alone. His method was of itself inapplicable to a subject where the premises were assumed to be certain, and the results known. His aim was to seek for unknown results by simple experiment. It was against received authority and accepted tradition in matters of inquiry that his whole system protested; what he urged was the need of making belief rest strictly on proof, and proof rest on the conclusions drawn from evidence by reason. But in theology—all theologians asserted—reason played but a subordinate part. “If I proceed to treat of it,” said Bacon, “I shall step out of the bark of human reason, and enter into the ship of the church. Neither will the stars of philosophy, which have hitherto so nobly shone on us, any longer give us their light.”

860. The certainty, indeed, of conclusions on such subjects was out of harmony with the grandest feature of Bacon's work, his noble confession of the liability of every inquirer to error. It was his especial task to warn men against the “vain shows” of knowledge which had so long hindered any real advance in it, the “idols” of the tribe, the den, the forum, and the theater, the errors which spring from the systematizing spirit which pervades all masses of men, or from individual idiosyncrasies, or from the strange power of words and phrases over the mind, or from the traditions of the past. Nor were the claims

of theology easily to be reconciled with the position which he was resolute to assign to natural science. "Through all those ages," Bacon says, "wherein men of genius or learning principally or even moderately flourished, the smallest part of human industry has been spent on natural philosophy, though this ought to be esteemed as the great mother of the sciences; for all the rest, if torn from this root, may perhaps be polished and formed for use, but can receive little increase." It was by the adoption of the method of inductive inquiry which physical science was to make its own, and by basing inquiry on grounds which physical science could supply, that the moral sciences, ethics and politics, could alone make any real advance. "Let none expect any great promotion of the sciences, especially in their effective part, unless natural philosophy be drawn out to particular sciences; and, again, unless these particular sciences be brought back again to natural philosophy. From this defect it is that astronomy, optics, music, many mechanical arts, and (what seems stranger) even moral and civil philosophy and logic rise but little above the foundations, and only skim over the varieties and surfaces of things." It was this lofty conception of the position and destiny of natural science which Bacon was the first to impress upon mankind at large. The age was one in which knowledge was passing to fields of inquiry which had till then been unknown, in which Kepler and Galileo were creating modern astronomy, in which Descartes was revealing the laws of motion, and Harvey the circulation of the blood. But to the mass

of men this great change was all but imperceptible; and it was the energy, the profound conviction, the eloquence of Bacon which first called the attention of mankind as a whole to the power and importance of physical research. It was he who, by his lofty faith in the results and victories of the new philosophy, nerved its followers to a zeal and confidence equal to his own. It was he, above all, who gave dignity to the slow and patient processes of investigation, of experiment, of comparison, to the sacrifice of hypothesis to fact, to the single aim after truth, which was to be the law of modern science.

861. While England thus became "a nest of singing birds," while Bacon was raising the lofty fabric of his philosophical speculation, the people itself was waking to a new sense of national freedom. Elizabeth saw the forces, political and religious, which she had stubbornly held in check for half a century, pressing on her irresistibly. In spite of the rarity of its assemblings, in spite of high words and imprisonment and dexterous management, the parliament had quietly gained a power which, at her accession, the queen could never have dreamed of its possessing. Step by step the lower house had won the freedom of its members from arrest, save by its own permission; the right of punishing and expelling members for crimes committed within its walls; and of determining all matters relating to elections. The more important claim of freedom of speech had brought on from time to time a series of petty conflicts in which Elizabeth generally gave way. But on this point the commons still shrank from any con-

sistent repudiation of the queen's assumption of control. A bold protest of Peter Wentworth against her claim to exercise such a control in 1575 was met, indeed, by the house itself with his committal to the Tower; and the bolder questions which he addressed to the parliament of 1588, "Whether this council is not a place for every member of the same, freely and without control, by bill or speech, to utter any of the griefs of the commonwealth?" brought on him a fresh imprisonment at the hands of the council, which lasted till the dissolution of the parliament, and with which the commons declined to interfere. But while vacillating in its assertion of the rights of individual members, the house steadily claimed for itself a right to discuss even the highest matters of state. Three great subjects, the succession, the church, and the regulation of trade, had been regarded by every Tudor sovereign as lying exclusively within the competence of the crown. But parliament had again and again asserted its right to consider the succession. It persisted, in spite of censure and rebuff, in presenting schemes of ecclesiastical reform. And three years before Elizabeth's death it dealt boldly with matters of trade. Complaints made in 1571 of the licenses and monopolies by which internal and external commerce were fettered were repressed by a royal reprimand as matters neither pertaining to the commons nor within the compass of their understanding. When the subject was again stirred, nearly twenty years afterward, Sir Edward Hoby was sharply rebuked by "a great personage" for his complaint of

the illegal exactions made by the exchequer. But the bill which he promoted was sent up to the lords in spite of this, and, at the close of Elizabeth's reign, the storm of popular indignation which had been roused by the growing grievance nerved the commons, in 1601, to a decisive struggle. It was in vain that the ministers opposed a bill for the abolition of monopolies, and, after four days of vehement debate, the tact of Elizabeth taught her to give way. She acted with her usual ability, declared her previous ignorance of the existence of the evil, thanked the house for its interference, and quashed at a single blow every monopoly that she had granted.

862. Dexterous as was Elizabeth's retreat, the defeat was none the less a real one. Political freedom was proving itself again the master in the long struggle with the crown. Nor in her yet fiercer struggle against religious freedom could Elizabeth look forward to any greater success. The sharp suppression of the Martin Marprelate pamphlets was far from damping the courage of the Presbyterians. Cartwright, who had been appointed by Lord Leicester to the mastership of an hospital at Warwick, was bold enough to organize his system of church discipline among the clergy of that county and of Northamptonshire. His example was widely followed; and the general gatherings of the whole ministerial body of the clergy and the smaller assemblies for each diocese or shire, which, in the Presbyterian scheme, bore the name of synods and classes, began to be held in many parts of England for the purposes of debate and consultation. The new organization

was quickly suppressed, but Cartwright was saved from the banishment which Whitgift demanded by a promise of submission, and his influence steadily widened. With Presbyterianism itself, indeed, Elizabeth was strong enough to deal. Its dogmatism and bigotry were opposed to the better temper of the age, and it never took any popular hold on England. But if Presbyterianism was limited to a few, Puritanism, the religious temper which sprang from a deep conviction of the truth of Protestant doctrines and of the falsehood of Catholicism, had become, through the struggle with Spain and the papacy, the temper of three-fourths of the English people. Unluckily the policy of Elizabeth did its best to give to the Presbyterians the support of Puritanism. Her establishment of the ecclesiastical commission had given fresh life and popularity to the doctrines which it aimed at crushing, by drawing together two currents of opinion which were in themselves perfectly distinct. The Presbyterian platform of church discipline had as yet been embraced by the clergy only, and by few among the clergy. On the other hand, the wish for a reform in the liturgy, the dislike of "superstitious usages," of the use of the surplice, the sign of the cross in baptism, the gift of the ring in marriage, the posture of kneeling at the Lord's supper, was shared by a large number of the clergy and the laity alike. At the opening of Elizabeth's reign almost all the higher churchmen, save Parker, were opposed to them, and a motion for their abolition in convocation was lost but by a single vote. The temper of the country gentlemen on this subject was

indicated by that of parliament; and it was well known that the wisest of the queen's counselors, Burleigh, Walsingham, and Knollys, were at one time in this matter with the gentry. If their common persecution did not wholly succeed in fusing these two sections of religious opinion into one, it at any rate gained for the Presbyterians a general sympathy on the part of the Puritans, which raised them from a clerical clique into a popular party.

863. But if Elizabeth's task became more difficult at home, the last years of her reign were years of splendor and triumph abroad. The overthrow of Philip's hopes in France had been made more bitter by the final overthrow of his hopes at sea. In 1596 his threat of a fresh armada was met by the daring descent of an English force upon Cadiz. The town was plundered and burned to the ground; thirteen vessels of war were fired in its harbor, and the stores accumulated for the expedition utterly destroyed. In spite of this crushing blow, a Spanish fleet gathered in the following year and set sail for the English coast; but, as in the case of its predecessor, storms proved more fatal than the English guns, and the ships were wrecked and almost destroyed in the bay of Biscay. Meanwhile, whatever hopes remained of subjecting the Low Countries were destroyed by the triumph of Henry of Navarre. A triple league of France, England, and the Netherlands left Elizabeth secure to the eastward; and the only quarter in which Philip could now strike a blow at her was the great dependency of England in the west. Since the failure of the Spanish force at

Smerwick, the power of the English government had been recognized everywhere throughout Ireland. But it was a power founded solely on terror, and the outrages and exactions of the soldiery, who had been flushed with rapine and bloodshed in the south, sowed, during the years which followed the reduction of Munster, the seeds of a revolt more formidable than any which Elizabeth had yet encountered. The tribes of Ulster, divided by the policy of Sidney, were again united by a common hatred of their oppressors; and in Hugh O'Neill they found a leader of even greater ability than Shane himself. Hugh had been brought up at the English court and was in manners and bearing an Englishman. He had been rewarded for his steady loyalty in previous contests by a grant of the earldom of Tyrone, and in his contest with a rival chieftain of his clan he had secured aid from the government by an offer to introduce the English laws and shire system into his new country. But he was no sooner undisputed master of the north than his tone gradually changed. Whether from a long-formed plan, or from suspicion of English designs upon himself, he at last took a position of open defiance.

864. It was at the moment when the treaty of Verdun and the wreck of the second armada freed Elizabeth's hands from the struggle with Spain that the revolt under Hugh O'Neill broke the quiet which had prevailed since the victories of Lord Grey. The Irish question again became the chief trouble of the queen. The tide of her recent triumphs seemed at first to have turned. A defeat of the English forces

in Tyrone caused a general rising of the northern tribes, and a great effort made in 1599 for the suppression of the growing revolt failed through the vanity and disobedience, if not the treacherous complicity, of the queen's lieutenant, the young Earl of Essex. His successor, Lord Mountjoy, found himself master, on his arrival, of only a few miles round Dublin. But in three years the revolt was at an end. A Spanish force, which landed to support it at Kinsale, was driven to surrender; a line of forts secured the country as the English mastered it; all open opposition was crushed out by the energy and the ruthlessness of the new lieutenant; and a famine which followed on his ravages completed the devastating work of the sword. Hugh O'Neill was brought in triumph to Dublin; the Earl of Desmond, who had again roused Munster into revolt, fled for refuge to Spain; and the work of conquest was at last brought to a close.

865. The triumph of Mountjoy flung its luster over the last days of Elizabeth, but no outer triumph could break the gloom which gathered round the dying queen. Lonely as she had always been, her loneliness deepened as she drew toward the grave. The statesmen and warriors of her earlier days had dropped one by one from her council-board. Leicester had died in the year of the Armada; two years later Walsingham followed him to the grave; in 1598 Burleigh himself passed away. Their successors were watching her last moments, and intriguing for favor in the coming reign. Her favorite, Lord Essex, not only courted favor with James of Scot-

land, but brought him to suspect Robert Cecil, who had succeeded his father at the queen's council-board, of designs against his succession. The rivalry between the two ministers hurried Essex into fatal projects which led to his failure in Ireland and to an insane outbreak of revolt which brought him, in 1601, to the block. But Cecil had no sooner proved the victor in this struggle at court than he himself entered into a secret correspondence with the King of Scots. His action was wise; it brought James again into friendly relations with the queen; and paved the way for a peaceful transfer of the crown. But hidden as this correspondence was from Elizabeth, the suspicion of it only added to her distrust. The troubles of the war in Ireland brought fresh cares to the aged queen. It drained her treasury. The old splendor of her court waned and disappeared. Only officials remained about her, "the other of the council and nobility estrange themselves by all occasions." The love and reverence of the people itself lessened as they felt the pressure and taxation of the war. Of old, men had pressed to see the queen as if it were a glimpse of heaven. "In the year 1588," a bishop tells us, who was then a country boy fresh come to town, "I did live at the upper end of the Strand, near St. Clement's church, when suddenly there came a report to us (it was in December, much about five of the clock at night, very dark) that the queen was gone to council, 'and if you will see the queen you must come quickly.' Then we all ran, when the court gates were set open, and no man did hinder us from coming in. There we came, where

there was a far greater company than was usually at Lenten sermons; and when we had staid there an hour and that the yard was full, there being a number of torches, the queen came out in great state. Then we cried, 'God save your majesty! God save your majesty!' Then the queen turned to us and said, 'God bless you all, my good people!' Then we cried again, 'God bless your majesty! God bless your majesty!' Then the queen said again to us, 'You may well have a greater prince, but you shall never have a more loving prince.' And so, looking one upon another a while, the queen departed. This wrought such an impression on us, for shows and pageantry are ever best seen by torchlight, that all the way long we did nothing but talk what an admirable queen she was, and how we would adventure our lives to do her service." But now, as Elizabeth passed along in her progresses, the people whose applause she courted remained cold and silent. The temper of the age, in fact, was changing, and isolating her as it changed. Her own England, the England which had grown up around her, serious, moral, prosaic, shrank coldly from this brilliant, fanciful, unscrupulous child of earth and the renaissance.

866. But if ministers and courtiers were counting on her death, Elizabeth had no mind to die. She had enjoyed life as the men of her day enjoyed it, and now that they were gone she clung to it with a fierce tenacity. She hunted, she danced, she jested with her young favorites, she coquetted and scolded and frolicked at sixty-seven as she had done at thirty. "The queen," wrote a courtier a few months before

her death, "was never so gallant these many years nor so set upon jollity." She persisted, in spite of opposition, in her gorgeous progresses from country-house to country-house. She clung to business as of old, and rated in her usual fashion "one who minded not to giving up some matter of account." But death crept on. Her face became haggard, and her frame shrank almost to a skeleton. At last her taste for finery disappeared, and she refused to change her dresses for a week together. A strange melancholy settled down on her. "She held in her hand," says one who saw her in her last days, "a golden cup, which she often put to her lips; but, in truth, her heart seemed too full to need more filling." Gradually her mind gave way. She lost her memory, the violence of her temper became unbearable, her very courage seemed to forsake her. She called for a sword to lie constantly beside her, and thrust it from time to time through the arras, as if she heard murderers stirring there. Food and rest became alike distasteful. She sat day and night propped up with pillows on a stool, her finger on her lip, her eyes fixed on the floor, without a word. If she once broke the silence, it was with a flash of her old queenliness. When Robert Cecil declared that she "must" go to bed the word roused her like a trumpet. "Must!" she exclaimed; "*is must* a word to be addressed to princes? Little man, little man! thy father, if he had been alive, durst not have used that word." Then, as her anger spent itself, she sank into her old dejection. "Thou art so presumptuous," she said, "because thou knowest I shall die."

She rallied once more when the ministers beside her bed named Lord Beauchamp, the heir to the Suffolk claim, as a possible successor. "I will have no rogue's son," she cried hoarsely, "in my seat." But she gave no sign, save a motion of the head, at the mention of the King of Scots. She was, in fact, fast becoming insensible; and early the next morning, on the 24th of March, 1603, the life of Elizabeth, a life so great, so strange and lonely in its greatness, ebbed quietly away.

## BOOK VII.

## PURITAN ENGLAND.

(1603—1660.

## AUTHORITIES FOR BOOK VII.

867. FOR the reign of James the First we have Camden's "Annals" of that king, Goodman's "Court of King James I.," Weldon's "Secret History of the Court of James I.," Roger Coke's "Detection," the correspondence in the "Cabala," the letters published under the title of "The Court and Times of James I.," the documents in Winwood's "Memorials of State," and the reported proceedings of the last two parliaments. The Camden Society has published the correspondence of James with Cecil, and Walter Yonge's "Diary." The letters and works of Bacon, now fully edited by Mr. Spedding, are necessary for any true understanding of the period. Hacket's "Life of Williams" and Harrington's "Nugæ Antiquæ" throw valuable side-light on the politics of the time. But the Stuart system, both at home and abroad, can only fairly be read by the light of the state-papers of this and the following reign, calendars of which are now being published by the master of the rolls. It is his employment of these as well as his own fairness and good sense which gives

value to the series of works which Mr. Gardiner has devoted to this period; his "History of England from the Accession of James the First," his "History of the Spanish Marriages," "England under the Duke of Buckingham," and "The Personal Government of Charles the First." The series has as yet been carried to 1637. To Mr. Gardiner also we owe the publication, through the Camden Society, of reports of some of the earlier Stuart parliaments. Ranke's "History of England during the Seventeenth Century" has the same documentary value as embodying the substance of state-papers in both English and foreign archives, which throw great light on the foreign politics of the Stuart kings. It covers the whole period of Stuart rule. With the reign of Charles the First our historical materials increase. For Laud we have his remarkable "Diary;" for Strafford, the "Strafford Letters." Hallam, has justly characterized Clarendon's "History of the Rebellion" as belonging "rather to the class of memoirs" than of histories; and the rigorous analysis of it by Ranke shows the very different value of its various parts. Though the work will always retain a literary interest from its nobleness of style and the grand series of character-portraits which it embodies, the worth of its account of all that preceded the war is almost destroyed by the contrast between its author's conduct at the time and his later description of the parliament's proceedings, as well as by the deliberate and malignant falsehood with which he has perverted the whole action of his parliamentary opponents. With the outbreak of the war he be-

comes of greater value, and he gives a good account of the Cornish rising; but from the close of the first struggle his work becomes tedious and unimportant. May's "*History of the Long Parliament*" is fairly accurate and impartial; but the basis of any real account of it must be found in its own proceedings as they have been preserved in the notes of Sir Ralph Verney and Sir Simonds D'Ewes. The last remain unpublished; but Mr. Forster has drawn much from them in his two works, "*The Grand Remonstrance*" and "*The Arrest of the Five Members*." The collections of state-papers by Rushworth and Nalson are indispensable for this period. It is illustrated by a series of memoirs, of very different degrees of value, such as those of Whitelock, Ludlow, Sir Philip Warwick, Holles, and Major Hutchinson, as well as by works like Mrs. Hutchinson's memoir of her husband, Baxter's "*Autobiography*," or Sir Thomas Herbert's memoirs of Charles during his last two years. The diary of Nehemiah Wallington gives us the common life of Puritanism during this troubled time. For Cromwell the primary authority is Mr. Carlyle's "*Life and Letters of Cromwell*," an invaluable store of documents, edited with the care of an antiquarian and the genius of a poet. Fairfax may be studied in the "*Fairfax Correspondence*," and in the documents embodied in Mr. Clements Markham's life of him. Sprigge's "*Anglia Rediviva*" gives an account of the New Model and its doings. Thurlow's state-papers furnish an immense mass of documents for the period of the protectorate; and Burton's "*Diary*" gives an account of the proceedings

in the protector's second parliament. For Irish affairs we have a vast store of materials in the Ormond papers and letters collected by Carte; for Scotland we have "Baillie's Letters," Burnet's "Lives of the Hamiltons," and Sir James Turner's "Memoir of the Scotch Invasion." Among the general accounts of this reign we may name Disraeli's "Commentaries of the Reign of Charles I." as prominent on one side, Brodie's "History of the British Empire" and Godwin's "History of the Commonwealth" on the other. Guizot in his three works on "Charles I. and the Revolution," "Cromwell and the Protectorate," and "Richard Cromwell and the Restoration," is accurate and impartial; and the documents he has added are valuable for the foreign history of the time. A good deal of information may be found in Forster's "Lives of the Statesmen of the Commonwealth" and Sandford's "Illustrations of the Great Rebellion."

---

## CHAPTER I.

### ENGLAND AND PURITANISM.

1603—1660.

868. THE death of Elizabeth is one of the turning-points of English history. The age of the renaissance and of the new monarchy passed away with the queen. The whole face of the realm had been silently changing during the later years of her reign. The dangers which had hitherto threatened our national existence and our national unity had alike

disappeared. The kingdom which had been saved from ruin but fifty years before by the jealousies of its neighbors now stood in the forefront of European powers. France clung to its friendship. Spain trembled beneath its blows. The papacy had sullenly withdrawn from a fruitless strife with the heretic island. The last of the queen's labors had laid Ireland at her feet, and her death knit Scotland to its ancient enemy by the tie of a common king. Within England itself the change was as great. Religious severance, the most terrible of national dangers, had been averted by the patience and ruthlessness of the crown. The Catholics were weak and held pitilessly down. The Protestant sectaries were hunted as pitilessly from the realm. The ecclesiastical compromise of the Tudors had at last won the adhesion of the country at large. Nor was the social change less remarkable. The natural growth of wealth and a patient good government had gradually put an end to all social anarchy. The dread of feudal revolt had passed forever away. The fall of the northern earls, of Norfolk and of Essex, had broken the last strength of the older houses. The baronage had finally made way for a modern nobility; but this nobility, sprung as it was from the court of the Tudors and dependent for its existence on the favor of the crown, had none of that traditional hold on the people at large which made the feudal lords so formidable a danger to public order.

869. If the older claims of freedom had been waived in presence of the dangers which so long beset even national existence, the disappearance of

these dangers brought naturally with it a revival of the craving for liberty and self-government. And once awakened, such a craving found a solid backing in the material progress of the time, in the upgrowth of new social classes, in the intellectual development of the people, and in the new boldness and vigor of the national temper. The long outer peace, the tranquillity of the realm, the lightness of taxation till the outbreak of war with Spain, had spread prosperity throughout the land. Even the war failed to hinder the enrichment of the trading classes. The Netherlands were the center of European trade, and of all European countries England had for more than half a century been making the greatest advance in its trade with the Netherlands. As early as in the eight years which preceded Elizabeth's accession, and the eight years that followed it, while the trade of Spain with the Low Countries had doubled, and that of France and Germany with them had grown threefold, the trade between England and Antwerp had increased twenty-fold. The increase remained at least as great through the forty years that followed, and the erection of stately houses, marriages with noble families, and the purchase of great estates showed the rapid growth of the merchant class in wealth and social importance. London, above all, was profiting by the general advance. The rapidity of its growth awoke the jealousy of the royal council. One London merchant, Thomas Sutton, founded the great hospital and school of the Charter House. Another, Hugh Myddelton, brought the New river from its springs at Chadwell and Am-

well to supply London with pure water. Ere many years had gone the wealth of the great capital was to tell on the whole course of English history. Nor was the merchant class alone in this elevation. If the greater nobles no longer swayed the state, the spoil of the church lands and the general growth of national wealth were raising the lesser landowners into a new social power. An influence which was to play a growing part in our history, the influence of the gentry, of the squires—as they were soon to be called—told more and more on English politics. In all but name, indeed, the leaders of this class were the equals of the peers whom they superseded. Men like the Wentworths in the north, or the Hampdens in the south, boasted as long a rent-roll and wielded as great an influence as many of the older nobles. The attitude of the lower house toward the higher throughout the Stuart parliaments sprang mainly from the consciousness of the commons that in wealth as well as in political consequence the merchants and country gentlemen who formed the bulk of their numbers stood far above the mass of the peers.

870. While a new social fabric was thus growing up on the wreck of feudal England, new influences were telling on its development. The immense advance of the people as a whole in knowledge and intelligence throughout the reign of Elizabeth was in itself a revolution. The hold of tradition, the unquestioning awe which formed the main strength of the Tudor throne, had been sapped and weakened by the intellectual activity of the renaissance, by its

endless questionings, its historic research, its philosophic skepticism. Writers and statesmen were alike discussing the claims of government and the wisest and most lasting forms of rule, travelers turned aside from the frescos of Giorgione to study the aristocratic polity of Venice, and Jesuits borrowed from the schoolmen of the middle ages a doctrine of popular rights which still forms the theory of modern democracy. On the other hand, the nation was learning to rely on itself, to believe in its own strength and vigor, to crave for a share in the guidance of its own life. His conflict with the two great spiritual and temporal powers of Christendom, his strife at once with the papacy and the house of Austria, had roused in every Englishman a sense of supreme manhood, which told, however slowly, on his attitude toward the crown. The seaman whose tiny bark had dared the storms of far-off seas, the young squire who crossed the channel to flesh his maiden sword at Ivry or Ostend, brought back with them to English soil the daring temper, the sense of inexhaustible resources, which had borne them on through storm and battle-field. The nation which gave itself to the rule of the Stuarts was another nation from the panic-struck people that gave itself in the crash of social and religious order to the guidance of the Tudors. It was plain that a new age of our history must open when the lofty patriotism, the dauntless energy, the overpowering sense of effort and triumph, which rose into their full grandeur through the war with Spain, turned from the strife with Philip to seek a new sphere of activity at home.

871. What had hindered this force from telling as yet fully on national affairs was the breadth and largeness which characterized the temper of the renaissance. Through the past half-century the aims of Englishmen had been drawn far over the narrow bounds of England itself to every land and every sea; while their mental activity spent itself as freely on poetry and science as on religion and politics. But at the moment which we have reached the whole of this energy was seized upon and concentrated by a single force. For a hundred years past men had been living in the midst of a spiritual revolution. Not only the world about them, but the world of thought and feeling within every breast had been utterly transformed. The work of the sixteenth century had wrecked that tradition of religion, of knowledge, of political and social order, which had been accepted without question by the middle ages. The sudden freedom of the mind from these older bonds brought a consciousness of power such as had never been felt before; and the restless energy, the universal activity of the renaissance, were but outer expressions of the pride, the joy, the amazing self-confidence with which man welcomed this revelation of the energies which had lain slumbering within him. But his pride and self reliance were soon dashed by a feeling of dread. With the deepening sense of human individuality came a deepening conviction of the boundless capacities of the human soul. Not as a theological dogma, but as a human fact, man knew himself to be an all but infinite power, whether for good or for ill. The drama

towered into sublimity as it painted the strife of mighty forces within the breasts of Othello or Macbeth. Poets passed into metaphysicians as they strove to unravel the workings of conscience within the soul. From that hour one dominant influence told on human action; and all the various energies that had been called into life by the age that was passing away were seized, concentrated, and steadied to a definite aim by the spirit of religion.

872. The whole temper of the nation felt the change. "Theology rules there," said Grotius of England only two years after Elizabeth's death; and when Casaubon was invited by her successor to his court he found both king and people indifferent to pure letters. "There is a great abundance of theologians in England," he says; "all point their studies in that direction." Even a country gentleman like Colonel Hutchinson felt the theological impulse. "As soon as he had improved his natural understanding with the acquisition of learning, the first studies he exercised himself in were the principles of religion." It was natural that literature should reflect the tendency of the time; and the dumpy little quartos of controversy and piety which still crowd our older libraries drove before them the classical translations and Italian novelettes of the age of the renaissance. But their influence was small beside that of the Bible. The popularity of the Bible had been growing fast from the day when Bishop Bonner set up the first six copies in St. Paul's. Even then, we are told, "many well-disposed people used much to resort to the hearing

thereof, especially when they could get any that had an audible voice to read to them." . . . One John Porter used sometimes to be occupied in that goodly exercise, to the edifying of himself as well as others. This Porter was a fresh young man and of big stature; and great multitudes would resort thither to hear him, because he could read well and had an audible voice." But the "goodly exercise" of readers such as Porter was soon superseded by the continued recitation of both Old Testament and New in the public services of the church; while the small Geneva Bibles carried the Scripture into every home, and wove it into the life of every English family.

873. Religion, indeed, was only one of the causes for the sudden popularity of the Bible. The book was equally important in its bearing on the intellectual development of the people. All the prose literature of England, save the forgotten tracts of Wycliffe, has grown up since the translation of the Scriptures by Tyndale and Coverdale. So far as the nation at large was concerned, no history, no romance, hardly any poetry save the little-known verse of Chaucer, existed in the English tongue, when the Bible was ordered to be set up in churches. Sunday after Sunday, day after day, the crowds that gathered round the Bible in the nave of St. Paul's, or the family group that hung on its words in the devotional exercises at home, were leavened with a new literature. Legend and annal, war-song and psalm, state roll and biography, the mighty voice of prophets, the parables of evangelists, stories of mission journeys, of perils by the sea and among the

heathen, philosophic arguments, apocalyptic visions, all were flung broadcast over minds unoccupied for the most part by any rival learning. The disclosure of the stores of Greek literature had wrought the revolution of the renaissance. The disclosure of the older mass of Hebrew literature wrought the revolution of the reformation. But the one revolution was far deeper and wider in its effects than the other. No version could transfer to another tongue the peculiar charm of language which gave their value to the authors of Greece and Rome. Classical letters, therefore, remained in the possession of the learned, that is, of the few; and among these, with the exception of Colet and More, or of the pedants who revived a pagan worship in the gardens of the Florentine academy, their direct influence was purely intellectual. But the language of the Hebrew, the idiom of the Hellenistic Greek, lent themselves with a curious felicity to the purposes of translation. As a mere literary monument, the English version of the Bible remains the noblest example of the English tongue, while its perpetual use made it from the instant of its appearance the standard of our language.

874. For the moment, however, its literary effect was less than its social. The power of the book over the mass of Englishmen showed itself in a thousand superficial ways, and in none more conspicuously than in the influence it exerted on ordinary speech. It formed, we must repeat, the whole literature which was practically accessible to ordinary Englishmen; and when we recall the number of common

phrases which we owe to great authors, the bits of Shakespeare, or Milton, or Dickens, or Thackeray, which unconsciously interweave themselves in our ordinary talk, we shall better understand the strange mosaic of Biblical words and phrases which colored English talk two hundred years ago. The mass of picturesque allusion and illustration which we borrow from a thousand books our fathers were forced to borrow from one; and the borrowing was the easier and the more natural that the range of the Hebrew literature fitted it for the expression of every phase of feeling. When Spenser poured forth his warmest love-notes in the "Epithalamion," he adopted the very words of the psalmist, as he bade the gates open for the entrance of his bride. When Cromwell saw the mists break over the hills of Dunbar, he hailed the sunburst with the cry of David: "Let God arise, and let his enemies be scattered. Like as the smoke vanisheth, so shalt thou drive them away!" Even to common minds this familiarity with grand poetic imagery in prophet and apocalypse gave a loftiness and ardor of expression that, with all its tendency to exaggeration and bombast, we may prefer to the slipshod vulgarisms of to-day.

875. But far greater than its effect on literature or social phrase was the effect of the Bible on the character of the people at large. The Bible was, as yet, the one book which was familiar to every Englishman; and everywhere its words, as they fell on ears which custom had not deadened to their force and beauty, kindled a startling enthusiasm. The whole moral effect which is produced nowadays by the

religious newspaper, the tract, the essay, the missionary report, the sermon, was then produced by the Bible alone; and its effect in this way, however dispassionately we examine it, was simply amazing. The whole nation became a church. The problems of life and death, whose questionings found no answer in the higher minds of Shakespeare's day, pressed for an answer not only from noble and scholar, but from farmer and shopkeeper in the age that followed him. The answer they found was almost of necessity a Calvinistic answer. Unlike as the spirit of Calvinism seemed to the spirit of the renaissance, both found a point of union in their exaltation of the individual man. The mighty strife of good and evil within the soul itself which had overawed the imagination of dramatist and poet became the one spiritual conception in the mind of the Puritan. The Calvinist looked on churches and communions as convenient groupings of pious Christians; it might be as even indispensable parts of a Christian order. But religion, in its deepest and innermost sense, had to do not with churches, but with the individual soul. It was each Christian man who held in his power the issues of life and death. It was in each Christian conscience that the strife was waged between heaven and hell. Not as one of a body, but as a single soul, could each Christian claim his part in the mystery of redemption. In the outer world of worship and discipline the Calvinist might call himself one of many brethren, but at every moment of his inner existence, in the hour of temptation and of struggle, in his dark and troubled wrestling with

sin, in the glory of conversion, in the peace of acceptance with God, he stood utterly alone. With such a conception of human life, Puritanism offered the natural form for English religion at a time when the feeling with which religion could most easily ally itself was the sense of individuality. The prentice who sat awed in the pit of the theater as the storm in the mind of Lear outdid the storm among the elements passed easily into the Calvinist who saw himself day by day the theater of a yet mightier struggle between the powers of light and the powers of darkness, and his soul the prize of an eternal conflict between heaven and hell.

876. It was thus by its own natural development that the temper of Englishmen became above all religious, and that their religion took in most cases the form of Calvinism. But the rapid spread of Calvinism was aided by outer causes as well as inner ones. The reign of Elizabeth had been a long struggle for national existence. When Shakespeare first trod the streets of London it was a question whether England should still remain England or whether it should sink into a vassal of Spain. In that long contest the creed which Henry and Elizabeth had constructed, the strange compromise of old tradition with new convictions which the country was gradually shaping into a new religion for itself, had done much for England's victory. It had held England together as a people. It had hindered any irreparable severance of the nation into warring churches. But it had done this unobserved. To the bulk of men the victory seemed wholly due to the energy and

devotion of Calvinism. Rome had placed herself in the forefront of England's enemies, and it was the Calvinistic Puritan who was the irreconcilable foe of Rome. It was the Puritan who went forth to fight the Spaniard in France or in the Netherlands. It was the Puritan who broke into the Spanish main, and who singed Philip's beard at Cadiz. It was the Puritan whose assiduous preachings and catechizings had slowly won the mass of the English people to any real acceptance of Protestantism. And as the war drifted on, as the hatred of Spain and resentment at the papacy grew keener and fiercer, as patriotism became more identified with Protestantism and Protestantism more identified with hatred of Rome, the side of English religion which lay furthest from all contact with the tradition of the past grew more and more popular among Englishmen.

877. To Elizabeth, whether on religious or political grounds, Calvinism was the most hateful of her foes. But it was in vain that she strove by a rigorous discipline to check its advance. Her discipline could only tell on the clergy, and the movement was far more a lay than a clerical one. Whether she would or no, in fact, the queen's policy favored the Puritan cause. It was impossible to befriend Calvinism abroad without furthering Calvinism at home. The soldiers and adventurers who flocked from England to fight in the Huguenot camps came back steeped in the Huguenot theology. The exiles who fled to England from France and from the Netherlands spread their narrower type of religion through

the towns where they found a refuge. As the strife with Rome grew hotter the government was forced to fill parliament and the magistracy with men whose zealous Protestantism secured their fidelity in the case of a Catholic rising. But a zealous Protestant was almost inevitably a Calvinist; and to place the administration of the country in Calvinist hands was to give an impulse to Puritanism. How utterly Elizabeth failed was seen at the beginning of her successor's reign. The bulk of the country gentlemen, the bulk of the wealthier traders, had by that time become Puritans. In the first parliament of James the house of commons refused, for the first time, to transact business on a Sunday. His second parliament chose to receive the communion at St. Margaret's Church instead of Westminster Abbey "for fear of copes and wafer-cakes."

878. The same difficulty met Elizabeth in her efforts to check the growth of Puritanism in the church itself. At the very outset of her reign the need of replacing the Marian bishops by staunch Protestants forced her to fill the English sees with men whose creed was in almost every case Calvinistic. The bulk of the lower clergy, indeed, were left without change; but as the older parsons died out their places were mostly filled by Puritan successors. The universities furnished the new clergy, and at the close of Elizabeth's reign the tone of the universities was hotly Puritan. Even the outer uniformity on which the queen set her heart took a Puritan form. The use of the prayer-book indeed was enforced; but the aspect of English churches and of English wor-

ship tended more and more to the model of Geneva. The need of more light to follow the service in the new prayer-books served as a pretext for the removal of stained glass from the church-windows. The communion-table stood almost everywhere in the midst of the church. If the surplice was generally worn during the service, the preacher often mounted the pulpit in a Geneva gown. We see the progress of this change in the very chapel of the primates themselves. The chapel of Lambeth House was one of the most conspicuous among the ecclesiastical buildings of the time; it was a place "whither many of the nobility, judges, clergy, and persons of all sorts, as well strangers as natives, resorted." But all pomp of worship gradually passed away from it. Under Cranmer the stained glass was dashed from its windows. In Elizabeth's time the communion-table was moved into the middle of the chapel, and the credence-table destroyed. Under James, Archbishop Abbott put the finishing stroke on all attempts at a high ceremonial. The cope was no longer used as a special vestment in the communion. The primate and his chaplains forebore to bow at the name of Christ. The organ and choir were alike abolished, and the service reduced to a simplicity which would have satisfied Calvin.

879. Foiled as it was, the effort of Elizabeth to check the spread of Puritanism was no mere freak of religious bigotry. It sprang from a clear realization of the impossibility of harmonizing the new temper of the nation with the system of personal government which had done its work under the Tu-

dors. With the republican and anti-monarchical theories, indeed, that Calvinism had begotten elsewhere, English Calvinism showed as yet no sort of sympathy. The theories of resistance, of a people's right to judge and depose its rulers which had been heard in the heat of the Marian persecution, had long sunk into silence. The loyalty of the Puritan gentleman was as fervent as that of his fellows. But with the belief of the Calvinist went necessarily a new and higher sense of political order. The old conception of personal rule, the dependence of a nation on the arbitrary will of its ruler, was jarring everywhere more and more with the religious as well as the philosophic impulses of the time. Men of the most different tendencies were reaching forward to the same conception of laws. Bacon sought for universal laws in material nature. Hooker asserted the rule of law over the spiritual world. It was in the same way that the Puritan sought for a divine law by which the temporal kingdoms around him might be raised into a kingdom of Christ. The diligence with which he searched the Scriptures sprang from his earnestness to discover a divine will which in all things, great or small, he might implicitly obey. But this implicit obedience was reserved for the divine will alone; for human ordinances derived their strength only from their correspondence with the revealed law of God. The Puritan was bound by his religion to examine every claim made on his civil and spiritual obedience by the powers that be; and to own or reject the claim as it accorded with the higher duty which he owed to God. "In matters of faith," a

Puritan wife tells us of her husband, "his reason always submitted to the word of God; but in all other things the greatest names in the world would not lead him without reason."

880. It was plain that an impassable gulf parted such a temper as this from the temper of unquestioning devotion to the crown which the Tudors termed loyalty; for it was a temper not only legal, but even pedantic in its legality, intolerant from its very sense of a moral order and law, of the lawlessness and disorder of a personal tyranny, a temper of criticism, of judgment, and, if need be, of stubborn and unconquerable resistance. The temper of the Puritan, indeed, was no temper of mere revolt. His resistance, if he was forced to resist, would spring, not from any disdain of kingly authority, but from his devotion to an authority higher and more sacred than that of kings. He had as firm a faith as the nation at large in the divine right of the sovereign, in the sacred character of the throne. It was, in fact, just because his ruler's authority had a divine origin that he obeyed him. But the nation about the throne seemed to the Puritan not less divinely ordered a thing than the throne itself; it was the voice of God inspiring and directing, which spoke through its history and its laws; it was God that guided to wisdom the hearts of Englishmen in parliament assembled as he guided to wisdom the hearts of kings. Never was the respect for positive law so profound; never was the reverence for parliaments so great as at the death of Elizabeth. There was none of the modern longing for a king that reigned without governing; no

conscious desire shows itself anywhere to meddle with the actual exercise of the royal administration. But the Puritan could only conceive of the kingly power as of a power based upon constitutional tradition, controlled by constitutional law, and acting in willing harmony with that body of constitutional counselors, in the two houses, who represented the wisdom and the will of the realm.

881. It was in the creation of such a temper as this that Puritanism gave its noblest gift to English politics. It gave a gift hardly less noble to society at large in its conception of social equality. Their common calling, their common brotherhood in Christ, annihilated in the minds of the Puritans that overpowering sense of social distinctions which characterized the age of Elizabeth. There was no open break with social traditions; no open revolt against the social subordination of class to class. But within these forms of the older world beat for the first time the spirit which was to characterize the new. The meanest peasant felt himself ennobled as a child of God. The proudest noble recognized a spiritual equality in the poorest "saint." The great social revolution of the civil wars and the protectorate was already felt in the demeanor of English gentlemen. "He had a loving and sweet courtesy to the poorest," we are told of one of them, "and would often employ many spare hours with the commonest soldiers and poorest laborers." "He never disdained the meanest nor flattered the greatest." But it was felt even more in the new dignity and self-respect with which the consciousness of their "calling" invested the classes be-

neath the rank of the gentry. Take such a portrait as that which a turner in Eastcheap, Nehemiah Wallington, has left us of a London housewife, his mother. "She was very loving," he says, "and obedient to her parents, loving and kind to her husband, very tender-hearted to her children, loving all that were godly, much misliking the wicked and profane. She was a pattern of sobriety unto many, very seldom was seen abroad except at church; when others recreated themselves at holidays and other times, she would take her needle-work and say, 'Here is my recreation.' . . . God had given her a pregnant wit and an excellent memory. She was very ripe and perfect in all stories of the Bible, likewise in all the stories of the martyrs, and could readily turn to them; she was also perfect and well seen in the English chronicles, and in the descents of the kings of England. She lived in holy wedlock with her husband twenty years, wanting but four days."

882. Where the new conception of life told even more powerfully than on politics or society was in its bearing on the personal temper and conduct of men. There was a sudden loss of the passion, the caprice, the subtle and tender play of feeling, the breadth of sympathy, the quick pulse of delight, which had marked the age of Elizabeth; but, on the other hand, life gained in moral grandeur, in a sense of the dignity of manhood, in orderliness and equable force. The larger geniality of the age that had passed away was replaced by an intense tenderness within the narrower circle of the home. Home, as we conceive it now, was the creation of the Puritan.

Wife and child rose from mere dependants on the will of husband or father, as husband and fathers saw in them saints like himself, souls hallowed by the touch of a divine spirit and called with a divine calling like his own. The sense of spiritual fellowship gave a new tenderness and refinement to the common family affections. "He was as kind a father," says a Puritan wife of her husband, "as dear a brother, as good a master, as faithful a friend as the world had." The willful and lawless passion of the renaissance made way for a manly purity. "Neither in youth nor riper years could the most fair or enticing woman draw him into unnecessary familiarity or dalliance. Wise and virtuous women he loved, and delighted in all pure and holy and unblameable conversation with them, but so as never to excite scandal or temptation. Scurrilous discourse even among men he abhorred; and though he sometimes took pleasure in wit and mirth, yet that which was mixed with impurity he never could endure." A higher conception of duty colored men's daily actions. To the Puritan the willfulness of life, in which the men of the renaissance had reveled, seemed unworthy of life's character and end. His aim was to attain self-command, to be master of himself, of his thought and speech and acts. A certain gravity and reflectiveness gave its tone to the lightest details of his converse with the world about him. His temper, quick as it might naturally be, was kept under strict control. In his discourse he was on his guard against talkativeness and frivolity, striving to be deliberate in speech, and "ranking the words before-

hand." His life was orderly and methodical, sparing of diet and self-indulgence; he rose early; "he never was at any time idle, and hated to see any one else so." The new sobriety and self-restraint showed itself in a change of dress. The gorgeous colors and jewels of the renaissance disappeared. The Puritan squire "left off very early the wearing of anything that was costly, yet in his plainest negligent habit appeared very much a gentleman."

883. The loss of color and variety in costume reflected, no doubt, a certain loss of color and variety in life itself. But as yet Puritanism was free from any break with the harmless gayeties of the world about it. The lighter and more elegant sides of the Elizabethan culture harmonized well enough with the temper of the Calvinist gentleman. The figure of such a Puritan as Colonel Hutchinson stands out from his wife's canvas with the grace and tenderness of a portrait by Vandyke. She dwells on the personal beauty which distinguished his youth, on "his teeth, even and white as the purest ivory," "his hair of brown, very thick-set in his youth, softer than the finest silk, curling with loose great rings at the end." Serious as was his temper in graver matters, the young squire of Owthorpe was fond of hawking, and piqued himself on his skill in dancing and fence. His artistic taste showed itself in a critical love of "paintings, sculpture, and all liberal arts," as well as in the pleasure he took in his gardens, "in the improvement of his grounds, in planting groves and walks and forest trees." If he was "diligent in his examination of the Scriptures,"

"he had a great love for music, and often diverted himself with a viol, on which he played masterly."

884. The strength, however, of the religious movement lay rather among the middle and professional classes than among the gentry; and it is in a Puritan of this class that we find the fullest and noblest expression of the new influence which was leavening the temper of the time. John Milton is not only the highest but the completest type of Puritanism. His life is absolutely contemporaneous with his cause. He was born when it began to exercise a direct influence over English politics and English religion; he died when its effort to mold them into its own shape was over, and when it had again sunk into one of many influences to which we owe our English character. His earlier verse, the pamphlets of his riper years, the epics of his age, mark with a singular precision the three great stages in its history. His youth shows us how much of the gayety, the poetic ease, the intellectual culture of the renaissance, lingered in a Puritan home. Scrivener and "precisian" as his father was, he was a skilled musician, and the boy inherited his father's skill on lute and organ. One of the finest outbursts in the scheme of education which he put forth at a later time is a passage in which he vindicates the province of music as an agent in moral training. His home, his tutor, his school were all rigidly Puritan; but there was nothing narrow or illiberal in his early training. "My father," he says, "destined me while yet a little boy to the study of humane letters; which I seized with such eagerness that from the twelfth year of my age

I scarcely ever went from my lessons to bed before midnight." But to the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew he learned at school, the scrivener advised him to add Italian and French. Nor were English letters neglected. Spenser gave the earliest turn to the boy's poetic genius. In spite of the war between playwright and precisian, a Puritan youth could still in Milton's days avow his love of the stage, "if Jonson's learned sock be on, or sweetest Shakespeare, Fancy's child, warble his native woodnotes wild," and gather from the "masks and antique pageantry" of the court-revel hints for his own "Comus" and "Arcades." Nor does any shadow of the coming struggle with the church disturb the young scholar's reverie, as he wanders beneath "the high embowed roof, with antique pillars massy proof, and storied windows, richly dight, casting a dim religious light," or as he hears "the pealing organ blow to the full-voiced choir below, in service high and anthem clear."

885. Milton's enjoyment of the gayety of life stands in bright contrast with the gloom and sternness which strife and persecution fostered in Puritanism at a later time. In spite of a "certain reservedness of natural disposition," which shrank from "festivities and jests, in which I acknowledge my faculty to be very slight," the young singer could still enjoy the "jest and youthful jollity" of the world around him, its "quips and cranks and wanton wiles;" he could join the crew of mirth, and look pleasantly on at the village fair, "where the jolly rebecks sound to many a youth and many a maid,

dancing in the checkered shade." There was nothing ascetic in Milton's look, in his slender, vigorous frame, his face full of a delicate yet serious beauty, the rich brown hair which clustered over his brow; and the words we have quoted show his sensitive enjoyment of all that was beautiful. But his pleasures were "unreproved." From coarse or sensual self-indulgence the young Puritan turned with disgust: "A certain reservedness of nature, an honest haughtiness and self-esteem, kept me still above those low descents of mind." He drank in an ideal chivalry from Spenser, though his religion and purity disdained the outer pledge on which chivalry built up its fabric of honor. "Every free and gentle spirit," said Milton, "without that oath, ought to be born a knight." It was with this temper that he passed from his London school, St. Paul's, to Christ's college, at Cambridge, and it was this temper that he preserved throughout his university career. He left Cambridge, as he said afterward, "free from all reproach, and approved by all honest men," with a purpose of self-dedication "to that same lot, however mean or high, toward which time leads me and the will of heaven."

886. Even in the still, calm beauty of a life such as this we catch the sterner tones of the Puritan temper. The very height of the Puritan's aim, the intensity of his moral concentration, brought with them a loss of the genial delight in all that was human which gave its charm to the age of Elizabeth. "If ever God instilled an intense love of moral beauty into the mind of any man," said the great

Puritan poet, "he has instilled it into mine." "Love Virtue," closed his "Comus;" "she alone is free!" But this passionate love of virtue and of moral beauty, if it gave strength to human conduct, narrowed human sympathy and human intelligence. Already in Milton we note "a certain reservedness of temper," a contempt for "the false estimates of the vulgar," a proud withdrawal from the meaner and coarser life around him. Great as was his love for Shakespeare, we can hardly fancy him delighting in Falstaff. In minds of a less cultured order, this moral tension ended, no doubt, in a hard, unsocial sternness of life. The ordinary Puritan "loved all that were godly, much misliking the wicked and profane." His bond to other men was not the sense of a common manhood, but the recognition of a brotherhood among the elect. Without the pale of the saints lay a world which was hateful to them, because it was the enemy of their God. It is this utter isolation from the "ungodly" that explains the contrast which startles us between the inner tenderness of the Puritans and the ruthlessness of so many of their actions. Cromwell, whose son's death (in his own words) went to his heart "like a dagger, indeed it did!" and who rode away sad and wearied from the triumph of Marston moor, burst into horseplay as he signed the death-warrant of the king.

887. A temper which had lost sympathy with the life of half the world around it could hardly sympathize with the whole of its own life. Humor, the faculty which above all corrects exaggeration and extravagance, died away before the new stress and

strain of existence. The absolute devotion of the Puritan to a supreme will tended more and more to rob him of all sense of measure and proportion in common matters. Little things became great things in the glare of religious zeal; and the godly man learnt to shrink from a surplice, or a mince-pie at Christmas, as he shrank from impurity or a lie. Nor was this all. The self-restraint and sobriety which marked the Calvinist limited itself wholly to his outer life. In his inner soul sense, reason, judgment, were too often overborne by the terrible reality of invisible things. Our first glimpse of Oliver Cromwell is as a young country squire and farmer in the marsh-levels around Huntingdon and St. Ives, buried from time to time in a deep melancholy, and haunted by fancies of coming death. "I live in Meshac," he writes to a friend, "which they say signifies prolonging; in Kedar, which signifies darkness; yet the Lord forsaketh me not." The vivid sense of a divine purity close to such men made the life of common men seem sin. "You know what my manner of life has been," Cromwell adds. "Oh, I lived in and loved darkness, and hated light. I hated godliness." Yet his worst sin was probably nothing more than an enjoyment of the natural buoyancy of youth, and a want of the deeper earnestness which comes with riper years. In imaginative tempers, like that of Bunyan, the struggle took a more picturesque form. John Bunyan was the son of a poor tinker at Elstow, in Bedfordshire, and even in childhood his fancy reveled in terrible visions of heaven and hell. "When I was

but a child of nine or ten years old," he tells us, "these things did so distress my soul, that then in the midst of my merry sports and childish vanities, amidst my vain companions, I was often much cast down and afflicted in my mind therewith; yet could I not let go my sins." The sins he could not let go were a love of hockey and of dancing on the village green; for the only real fault which his bitter self-accusation discloses, that of a habit of swearing, was put an end to at once and forever by a rebuke from an old woman. His passion for bell-ringing clung to him even after he had broken from it as a "vain practice;" and he would go to the steeple-house and look on, till the thought that a bell might fall and crush him in his sins drove him panic-stricken from the door. A sermon against dancing and games drew him for a time from these indulgences; but the temptation again overmastered his resolve. "I shook the sermon out of my mind, and to my old custom of sports and gaming I returned with great delight. But the same day, as I was in the midst of a game of cat, and having struck it one blow from the hole, just as I was about to strike it the second time, a voice did suddenly dart from heaven into my soul, which said, 'Wilt thou leave thy sins and go to heaven, or have thy sins and go to hell?' At this I was put in an exceeding maze; wherefore, leaving my cat upon the ground, I looked up to heaven; and was as if I had with the eyes of my understanding seen the Lord Jesus looking down upon me, as being very hotly displeased with me, and as if he did

severely threaten me with some grievous punishment for those and other ungodly practices."

888. The vivid sense of a supernatural world which breathes through words such as these, the awe and terror with which it pressed upon the life of men, found their most terrible expression in the belief in witchcraft. The dread of satanic intervention, indeed, was not peculiar to the Puritan. It had come down from the earliest ages of the Christian church, and had been fanned into a new intensity at the close of the middle ages by the physical calamities and moral skepticism which threw their gloom over the world. Joan of Arc was a witch to every Englishman, and the wife of Duke Humphrey of Gloucester paced the streets of London, candle in hand, as a convicted sorceress. But it was not till the chaos and turmoil of the reformation put its strain on the spiritual imagination of men that the belief in demoniacal possession deepened into a general panic. The panic was common to both Catholics and Protestants; it was in Catholic countries, indeed, that the persecution of supposed witches was carried on longest and most ruthlessly. Among Protestant countries England was the last to catch the general terror; and the act of 1541, the first English statute passed against witchcraft, was far milder in tone than the laws of any other European country. Witchcraft itself, where no death could be proved to have followed from it, was visited only with pillory and imprisonment; where death had issued from it, the penalty was the gallows and

not the stake. Even this statute was repealed in the following reign. But the fierce religious strife under Mary roused a darker fanaticism; and when Elizabeth mounted the throne preacher after preacher assured her that a multitude of witches filled the land. "Witches and sorcerers," cried Bishop Jewel, "within these few years are marvelously increased within your grace's realm. Your grace's subjects pine away even unto the death; their color fadeth, their flesh rotteth, their speech is benumbed, their senses are bereft!" Before remonstrances such as these the statute against witchcraft was again enacted; but though literature and the drama show the hold which a belief in satanic agency had gained on the popular fancy, the temper of the times was too bold and self-reliant, its intelligence too keen and restless, its tone too secular, to furnish that atmosphere of panic in which fanaticism is bred.

889. It was not till the close of the queen's reign, as hope darkened round Protestantism and the Puritan temper woke a fresh faith in the supernatural, that the belief in witchcraft and the persecution of the unhappy women who were held to be witches became a marked feature of the time. To men who looked on the world about them and the soul within them as battle-fields for a never-ceasing contest between God and the devil, it was natural enough to ascribe every evil that happened to man, either in soul or body, to the invisible agency of the spirit of ill. A share of his supernatural energies was the bait by which he was held to lure the wicked to their own destruction; and women above all were

believed to barter their souls for the possession of power which lifted them above the weakness of their sex. Sober men asserted that the beldame, whom boys hooted in the streets and who groped in the gutter for bread, could blast the corn with mildew and lame the oxen in the plow, that she could smite her persecutors with pains and sickness, that she could rouse storms in the sky and strew every shore with the wrecks of ships and the corpses of men, that as night gathered round she could mount her broomstick and sweep through the air to the witches' Sabbath, to yield herself in body and soul to the demons of ill. The nascent skepticism that startled at tales such as these were hushed before the witness of the Bible, for to question the existence of sorcerer or demoniac seemed questioning the veracity of the Scriptures themselves. Pity fell before the stern injunction "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live;" and the squire who would have shrunk from any conscious cruelty as from a blow looked on without ruth as the torturers ran needles into the witch's flesh, or swam her in the witch's pool, or hurried her to the witch's stake.

890. But the terror with which the Puritan viewed these proofs of a new energy in the powers of ill found a wider sphere of action as he saw their new activity and success in the religious and political world about him. At the opening of Elizabeth's reign every Protestant had looked forward to a world-wide triumph of the gospel. If Italy and Spain clung blindly to the papacy elsewhere, alike on the Danube or the Rhine, on the Elbe or the

Seine, the nations of Europe seemed to have risen in irreconcilable revolt against Rome. But the prospect of such a triumph had long since disappeared. At the crisis of the struggle a Catholic reaction had succeeded in holding Protestantism at bay, and after years of fierce combat Rome had begun definitely to win ground. The peaceful victories of the Jesuits were backed by the arms of Spain, and Europe was gradually regained till the policy of Philip the Second was able to aim its blows at the last strongholds of Calvinism in the west. Philip was undoubtedly worsted in the strife. England was saved by its defeat of the Armada. The united provinces of the Netherlands rose into a great power as well through their own dogged heroism as through the genius of William the Silent. At a moment, too, when all hope seemed gone France was rescued from the grasp of the Catholic league by the unconquerable energy of Henry of Navarre. But even in its defeat Catholicism gained ground. England alone remained unaffected by its efforts. In the Low Countries the reformation was finally driven from the Walloon provinces, from Brabant, and from Flanders. In France, Henry the Fourth found himself compelled to purchase Paris by a mass; and the conversion of the king was the beginning of a quiet breaking up of the Huguenot party. Nobles and scholars alike forsook the cause of heresy, and though Calvinism remained dominant south of the Loire, it lost all hope of winning France as a whole to its side.

891. At Elizabeth's death, therefore, the temper

of every earnest Protestant, in England as elsewhere, was that of a man who, after cherishing the hope of a crowning victory, is forced to look on at a crushing and irremediable defeat. The dream of a reformation of the universal church was utterly at an end. Though the fierce strife of religions seemed for a while to have died down, the borders of Protestantism were narrowing every day, nor was there a sign that the triumph of the papacy was arrested. Even the older Lutheranism of Germany was threatened; and the minds of men were already presaging the struggle which was to end in the Thirty Years' war. Such a struggle could be no foreign strife to the Puritan. The war in the Palatinate kindled a fiercer flame in the English parliament than all the aggressions of the monarchy; and Englishmen followed the campaigns of Gustavus with even keener interest than the trial of Hampden. We shall see how great a part this sympathy with outer Protestantism played in the earlier struggle between England and the Stuarts; but it played as great a part in determining the Puritan attitude toward religion at home. As hope after hope died into defeat and disaster the mood of the Puritan grew sterner and more intolerant. The system of compromise by which the Tudors had held England together became more and more distasteful to him. To one who looked on himself as a soldier of God and as a soldier who was fighting a losing battle, the struggle with the papacy was no matter for compromise. It was a struggle between light and darkness, between life and death. No innovation in faith or worship was of small ac-

count if it tended in the direction of Rome. The peril, in fact, was too great to admit of tolerance or moderation. At a moment when all that he hated was gaining ground on all that he loved, the Puritan saw the one security for what he held to be truth in drawing a hard and fast line between that truth and what he held to be falsehood.

892. This dogged concentration of thought and feeling on a single issue told with a fatal effect on his theology. The spirit of the renaissance had been driven for a while from the field of religion by the strife between Catholic and Protestant; and in the upgrowth of a more rigid system of dogma, whether on the one side or on the other, the work of More and Colet seemed to be undone. But no sooner had the strife lost its older intensity, no sooner had a new Christendom fairly emerged from the troubled waters, than the renaissance again made its influence felt. Its voice was heard above all in Richard Hooker, a clergyman who had been master of the Temple, but had been driven by his distaste for the controversies of its pulpit from London to a Wiltshire vicarage at Boscombe, which he exchanged at a later time for the parsonage of Bishopsbourne among the quiet meadows of Kent. During the later years of Elizabeth he built up in these still retreats the stately fabric of his "*Ecclesiastical Polity*." The largeness of temper which marked all the nobler minds of his day, the philosophic breadth which is seen as clearly in Shakespeare as in Bacon, was united in Hooker with a grandeur and stateliness of style which raised him to the highest rank among

English prose writers. Divine as he was, his spirit and method were philosophical rather than theological. Against the ecclesiastical dogmatism of Presbyterian or Catholic he set the authority of reason. He abandoned the narrow ground of scriptural argument to base his conclusions on the general principles of moral and political science, on the eternal obligations of natural law. The Puritan system rested on the assumption that an immutable rule for human action in all matters relating to religion, to worship, and to the discipline and constitution of the church was laid down, and only laid down, in the words of Scripture. Hooker urged that a divine order exists not in written revelation only, but in the moral relations, the historical development, and the social and political institutions of men. He claimed for human reason the province of determining the laws of this order; of distinguishing between what is changeable and unchangeable in them, between what is eternal and what is temporary in the Bible itself. It was easy for him to push on to the field of ecclesiastical controversy where men like Cartwright were fighting the battle of Presbyterianism, to show that no form of church government had ever been of indispensable obligation, and that ritual observances had in all ages been left to the discretion of churches and determined by the differences of times.

893. From the moment of its appearance the effect of the "Ecclesiastical Polity" was felt in the broader and more generous stamp which it impressed on the temper of the national church. Hooker had, in fact, provided with a theory and placed on grounds of

reason that policy of comprehension which had been forced on the Tudors by the need of holding England together, and from which the church, as it now existed, had sprung. But the truth on which Hooker based his argument was of far higher value than his argument itself. The acknowledgment of a divine order in human history, of a divine law in human reason, harmonized with the noblest instincts of the Elizabethan age. Raleigh's effort to grasp as a whole the story of mankind, Bacon's effort to bring all outer nature to the test of human intelligence, were but the crowning manifestations of the two main impulses of their time, its rationalism and its humanity. Both found expression in the work of Hooker; and colored through its results the after-history of the English church. The historical feeling showed itself in a longing to ally the religion of the present with the religion of the past, to find a unity of faith and practice with the church of the fathers, to claim part in that great heritage of Catholic tradition, both in faith and worship, which the papacy so jealously claimed as its own. Such a longing seized as much on tender and poetic tempers like George Herbert's as on positive and prosaic tempers, such as that of Laud. The one started back from the bare, intent spiritualism of the Puritan to find nourishment for his devotion in the outer associations which the piety of ages had grouped around it, in holy places and holy things, in the stillness of church and altar, in the pathos and exultation and prayer and praise, in the awful mystery of sacraments. The narrow and external mood

of the other, unable to find standing-ground in the purely personal relation between man and God which formed the basis of Calvinism, fell back on the consciousness of a living Christendom, preserving through the ages a definite faith and worship, and which, torn and rent as it seemed, was soon to resume its ancient unity.

894. While the historical feeling which breathes in Hooker's work took form in the new passion for tradition and ceremonialism, the appeal which it addressed to human reason produced a school of philosophical thinkers whose timid upgrowth was almost lost in the clash of warring creeds about them, but who were destined—as the latitudinarians of later days—to make as deep an impression as their dogmatic rivals on the religious thought of their countrymen. As yet, however, this rationalizing movement hovered on the borders of the system of belief which it was so keenly to attack; it limited itself rather to the work of moderating and reconciling, to recognizing, with Calixtus, the pettiness of the points of difference which parted Christendom and the greatness of its points of agreement, or to revolting, with Arminius, from the more extreme tenets of Calvin and Calvin's followers, and pleading like him for some co-operation on man's part with the work of grace. As yet Arminianism was little more than a reaction against a system that contradicted the obvious facts of life, a desire to bring theology into some sort of harmony with human experience; but it was soon to pass by a fatal necessity into a wider variance, and to gather round it into

one mass of opposition every tendency of revolt which time was disclosing against the Calvinism which now reigned triumphant in Protestant theology.

895. From the belief in humanity or in reason which gave strength to such a revolt the Puritan turned doggedly away. In the fierce white light of his idealism human effort seemed weakness, human virtue but sin, human reason but folly. Absorbed as he was in the thought of God, craving for nothing less than a divine righteousness, a divine wisdom, a divine strength, he grasped the written Bible as the law of God and concentrated every energy in the effort to obey it. The dogma of justification, the faith that without merit or act of man God would save and call to holiness his own elect, was the centre of his creed. And with such a creed he felt that the humanity of the renaissance, the philosophy of the thinker, the comprehension of the statesmen, were alike at war. A policy of comprehension seemed to him simply a policy of faithlessness to God. Ceremonies which in an hour of triumph he might have regarded as solaces to weak brethren, he looked on as acts of treason in this hour of defeat. Above all, he would listen to no words of reconciliation with a religious system in which he saw nothing but a lie, nor to any pleas for concession in what he held to be truth. The craving of the Arminian for a more rational theology he met by a fiercer loyalty to the narrowest dogma. Archbishop Whitgift had striven to force on the church of England a set of articles which embodied the tenets of an extreme

Calvinism; and one of the wisest acts of Elizabeth had been to disallow them. But hateful as Whitgift on every other ground was to the Puritans, they never ceased to demand the adoption of his Lambeth articles.

896. And as he would admit no toleration within the sphere of doctrine, so would the Puritan admit no toleration within the sphere of ecclesiastical order. That the church of England should, both in ceremonies and in teaching, take a far more distinctively Protestant attitude than it had hitherto done, every Puritan was resolved. But there was as yet no general demand for any change in the form of its government, or of its relation to the state. Though the wish to draw nearer to the mass of the reformed churches won a certain amount of favor for the Presbyterian form of organization which they had adopted, as an obligatory system of church discipline Presbyterianism had been embraced by but a few of the English clergy, and by hardly any of the English laity. Nor was there any tendency in the mass of the Puritans toward a breach in the system of religious conformity which Elizabeth had constructed. On the contrary, what they asked for was its more rigorous enforcement. That Catholics should be suffered, under whatever pains and penalties, to preserve their faith and worship in a Protestant commonwealth was abhorrent to them. Nor was Puritan opinion more tolerant to the Protestant sectaries who were beginning to find the state church too narrow for their enthusiasm. Elizabeth herself could not feel a bitterer abhorrence of

the "Brownists" (as they were called from the name of their founder, Robert Brown), who rejected the very notion of a national church, and asserted the right of each congregation to perfect independence of faith and worship. To the zealot, whose whole thought was of the fight with Rome, such an assertion seemed a claim of a right to mutiny in the camp, a right of breaking up Protestant England into a host of sects too feeble to hold Rome at bay. Cartwright himself denounced the wickedness of the Brownists; parliament, Puritan as it was, passed in 1593 a statute against them; and there was a general assent to the stern measures of repression by which Brown himself was forced to fly to the Netherlands. Two of his fellow-congregationalists were seized and put to death on charges of sedition and heresy. Of their followers, many, as we learn from a petition in 1592, were driven into exile, "and the rest which remained in her grace's land greatly distressed through imprisonment and other great troubles." The persecution, in fact, did its work. "As for those which we call Brownists," wrote Bacon, "being when they were at the most a very small number of very silly and base people, here and there in corners dispersed, they are now, thanks to God, by the good remedies that have been used, suppressed and worn out; so that there is scarce any news of them." The execution of three non-conformists in the following year was, in fact, followed by the almost utter extermination of their body. But against this persecution no Puritan voice was raised.

897. All, in fact, that the bulk of the Puritans asked was a change in the outer ritual of worship which should correspond to the advance toward a more pronounced Protestantism that had been made by the nation at large during the years of Elizabeth's reign. Their demands were as of old for the disuse of "superstitious ceremonies." To modern eyes the points which they selected for change seem trivial enough. But they were, in fact, of large significance. To reject the sign of the cross in baptism was to repudiate the whole world of ceremonies of which it was a survivor. The disuse of the surplice would have broken down the last outer difference which parted the minister from the congregation, and manifested to every eye the spiritual equality of layman and priest. Kneeling at the communion might be a mere act of reverence, but formally to discontinue such an act was emphatically to assert a disbelief in the sacramental theories of Catholicism. During the later years of Elizabeth reverence for the queen had hindered any serious pressure for changes to which she would never assent; but a general expectation prevailed that at her death some change would be made. Even among men of secular stamp there was a general conviction of the need of some concession to the religious sentiment of the nation. They had clung to the usages which the Puritans denounced so long as they were aids in hindering a religious severance throughout the land. But whatever value the retention of such ceremonies might have had in facilitating the quiet passage of the bulk of Englishmen

---

from the old worship to the new had long since passed away. England as a whole was Protestant; and the Catholics who remained were not likely to be drawn to the national church by trifles such as these. Instead of being the means of hindering religious division the usages had now become means of creating it. It was on this ground that statesmen who had little sympathy with the religious spirit about them pleaded for the purchase of religious and national union by ecclesiastical reforms. "Why," asked Bacon, "should the civil state be purged and restored by good and wholesome laws made every three years in parliament assembled, devising remedies as fast as time breedeth mischief, and contrariwise the ecclesiastical state still continue upon the dregs of time, and receive no alteration these forty five years or more?"

---

## CHAPTER II.

### THE KING OF SCOTS.

898. SUCH was the temper of England at the death of Elizabeth; and never had greater issues hung on the character of a ruler than hung on the character of her successor. Had he shared the sympathy with popular feeling which formed the strength of the Tudors, time might have brought peaceably about that readjustment of political forces which the growth of English energies had made a necessity. Had he possessed the genius of a great statesman, he might have distinguished in the mingled mass of im-

pulses about him between the national and sectarian, and have given scope to the nobleness of Puritanism while resolutely checking its bigotry. It was no common ill-fortune that set at such a crisis on the throne a ruler without genius as without sympathy, and that broke the natural progress of the people by a conflict between England and its kings.

899. Throughout the last days of Elizabeth most men had looked forward to a violent struggle for the crown. The more bigoted Catholics supported the pretensions of Isabella, the eldest daughter of Philip the Second of Spain. The house of Suffolk, which through the marriage of Lady Catharine Grey with Lord Hertford was now represented by their son, Lord Beauchamp, still clung to its parliamentary title under the will of Henry the Eighth. Even if the claim of the house of Stuart was admitted, there were some who held that the Scottish king, as an alien by birth, had no right of inheritance, and that the succession to the crown lay in the next Stuart heiress, Arabella Stuart, a granddaughter of Lady Lennox by her youngest son, Darnley's brother. But claims such as these found no general support. By a strange good fortune every great party in the realm saw its hopes realized in King James. The mass of the Catholics, who had always been favorable to a Scottish succession, were persuaded that the son of Mary Stuart would at least find toleration for his mother's co-religionists; and as they watched the distaste for Presbyterian rule and the tendency to comprehension which James had already manifested, they listened credulously to his emissaries.

On the other hand, the Puritans saw in him the king of a Calvinistic people, bred in a church which rejected the ceremonies that they detested and upheld the doctrines which they longed to render supreme, and who had till now, whatever his strife might have been with the claims of its ministers, shown no dissent from its creed or from the rites of its worship. Nor was he less acceptable to the more secular tempers who guided Elizabeth's counsels. The bulk of English statesmen saw too clearly the advantages of a union of the two kingdoms under a single head to doubt for a moment as to the succession of James. If Elizabeth had refused to allow his claim to be formally recognized by parliament she had pledged herself to suffer no detriment to be done to it there; and in her later days Cecil had come forward to rescue the young king from his foolish intrigues with English parties and Catholic powers, and to assure him of support. No sooner, in fact, was the queen dead than James Stuart was owned as king by the council without a dissentient voice.

900. To James himself the change was a startling one. He had been a king indeed from his cradle. But his kingdom was the smallest and meanest of European realms, and his actual power had been less than that of many an English peer. For years he had been the mere sport of warring nobles who governed in his name. Their rule was a sheer anarchy. For a short while after Mary's flight Murray showed the genius of a born master of men; but at the opening of 1570 his work was ended by the shot of a Hamilton. "What Bothwell-haugh has done,"

Mary wrote joyously from her English prison at the news, "has been done without order of mine; but I thank him all the more for it." The murder, in fact, plunged Scotland again into a chaos of civil war which, as the queen shrewdly foresaw, could only tend to the after-profit of the crown. A year later the next regent, the child-king's grandfather, Lord Lennox, was slain in a fray at Stirling; and it was only when the regency passed into the strong hand of Morton at the close of 1572, and when England intervened in the cause of order, that the land won a short breathing-space. Edinburgh, the last fortress held in Mary's name, surrendered to a force sent by Elizabeth; its captain, Kirkcaldy of Grange, was hung for treason in the market-place; and the stern justice of Morton forced peace upon the warring lords. But hardly five years had passed when a union of his rivals and their adroit crowning of the boy-king put an end to Morton's regency and gave a fresh aim to the factions who were tearing Scotland to pieces. To get hold of the king's person, to wield in his name the royal power, became the end of their efforts. The boy was safe only at Stirling; and even at Stirling a fray at the gate all but transferred him from the Erskines to fresh hands. It was in vain that James sought security in a body-guard, or strove to baffle the nobles by recalling a cousin, Esme Stuart, from France and giving him the control of affairs. A sudden flight back to Stirling only saved him from seizure at Doune; and a few months later, as James hunted at Ruthven, he found the hand of the master of Glamis on his bri-

dle-rein. "Better bairns greet than bearded men," was the gruff answer to his tears, as his favorite fled into exile and the boy-king saw himself again a tool in the hands of the lords.

901. Such was the world in which James had grown to manhood; a world of brutal swordsmen, in whose hands the boy who shrank from the very sight of a sword seemed helpless. But if the young king had little physical courage, morally he proved fearless enough. He drew confidence in himself from a sense of his intellectual superiority to the men about him. From his earliest years, indeed, James showed a precocious cleverness; and as a child he startled grave councilors by his "discourse, walking up and down in the Lady Mar's hand, of knowledge and ignorance." It was his amazing self-reliance which enabled him to bear the strange loneliness of his life. He had nothing in common with the turbulent nobles whose wild cries he had heard from the walls of Stirling Castle, as they slew his grandfather in the streets of the town below. But he had just as little sympathy with the spiritual or political world which was springling into life around his cradle. The republican Buchanan was his tutor, and he was bred in the religious school of Knox; but he shrank instinctively from Calvinism with its consecration of rebellion, its assertion of human equality, its declaration of the responsibility of kings, while he detected and hated the republican drift of the thinkers of the renaissance. In later years, James denounced the chronicles of both Buchanan and Knox as "infamous invectives," and would have

had their readers punished "even as it were their authors risen again." His temper and purpose were, in fact, simply those of the kings who had gone before him. He was a Stuart to the core; and from his very boyhood he set himself to do over again the work which the Stuarts had done.

902. Their work had been the building up of the Scottish realm, its change from a medley of warring nobles into an ordered kingdom. Never had freedom been bought at a dearer price than it was bought by Scotland in its long war of independence. Wealth and public order alike disappeared. The material prosperity of the country was brought to a standstill. The work of civilization was violently interrupted. The work of national unity was all but undone. The highlanders were parted by a sharp line of division from the lowlanders, while within the Lowlands themselves feudalism overmastered the crown. The nobles became almost wholly independent. The royal power, under the immediate successors of Bruce, sank into insignificance. From the walls of Stirling the Scotch kings of that earlier time looked out on a realm where they could not ride thirty miles to north or to south save at the head of a host of armed men. With James the First began the work of building the monarchy up again from this utter ruin; but the wresting of Scotland from the grasp of its nobles was only wrought out in a struggle of life and death. Few figures are more picturesque than the figures of the young Scotch kings as they dash themselves against the iron circle which girds them round in their desperate efforts to rescue the crown

---

from serfdom. They carry their life in their hands; a doom is on them; they die young and by violent deaths. One was stabbed by plotters in his bed-chamber. Another was stabbed in a peasant's hut where he had crawled for refuge after defeat. Another was slain by the bursting of a cannon. The fourth James fell more nobly at Flodden. The fifth died of a broken heart on the news of Solway Moss. But, hunted and slain as they were, the kings clung stubbornly to the task they had set themselves.

903. They stood almost alone. The Scottish people were too weak as yet to form a check on the baronage; and the one force on which the crown could reckon was the force of the church. To enrich the church, to bind its prelates closely to the monarchy by the gift of social and political power, was the policy of every Stuart. A greater force than that of the church lay in the dogged perseverance of the kings themselves. Little by little their work was done. The great house of Douglas was broken at last. The ruin of lesser houses followed in its train, and under the fifth of the Jameses Scotland saw itself held firmly in the royal grasp. But the work of the Stuarts was hardly done when it seemed to be undone again by the reformation. The prelates were struck down. The nobles were enormously enriched. The sovereign again stood alone in the face of the baronage. It was only by playing on their jealousies and divisions that Mary Stuart could withstand the nobles who banded themselves together to overawe the crown. Once she broke their ranks by her marriage with Darnley; and after the ill-fated

close of this effort she strove again to break their ranks by her marriage with Bothwell. Again the attempt failed; and Mary fled into life-long exile, while the nobles, triumphant at last in the strife with the crown, governed Scotland in the name of her child.

904. It was thus that in his boyhood James looked on the ruin of all that his fathers had wrought. But the wreck was not as utter as it seemed. Even in the storm of the reformation the sense of royal authority had not wholly been lost; the craving for public order, and the conviction that order could only be found in obedience to the sovereign, had, in fact, been quickened by the outbreak of faction; and the rule of Murray and Morton had shown how easily the turbulent nobles could be bent by an energetic use of the royal power. Lonely and helpless as he seemed, James was still king, and he was a king who believed in his kingship. The implicit faith in his own divine right to rule the greatest in the land gave him a strength as great as that of the regents. At seventeen he was strong enough to break the yoke of the Douglasses and to drive them over the English border. At eighteen he could bring the most powerful of the Protestant nobles, the Earl of Gowrie, to the block. A year later, indeed, the lords were back again; for the Armada was at hand, and Elizabeth distrusted the young king, who was intriguing at Paris and Madrid. English help brought back the exiles; "there was no need of words," James said bitterly to the lords as they knelt before him with protestations of loyalty; "weapons

had spoken loud enough." But their return was far from undoing his work. Elizabeth's pledges as to the succession, Jame's alliance with her against the Armada, restored the friendship of England; and once secure against English intervention, the king had little difficulty in resuming his mastery at home. A significant ceremony showed that the strife with the nobles was at an end. James summoned them to Edinburgh, and called on them to lay aside their feuds with one another. The pledge was solemnly given, and each noble, "holding his chief enemy by the hand," walked in his doublet to the market-cross of the city, while the people sang aloud for joy.

905. The policy of the Stuarts had at last reached its end, and James was master of the great houses that had so long overawed the crown. But he was farther than ever from being absolute master of his realm. Amid the turmoil of the reformation a new force had come to the front. This was the Scottish people itself. Till now peasant and burgher had been of small account in the land. The towns were little more than villages. The peasants scattered thinly over valley and hillside, and winning a scant subsistence from a thankless soil, were too few and too poor to be a political force. They were of necessity dependent on their lords; and in the centuries of feudal anarchy which followed the war of independence the strife of lord against lord made their life a mere struggle for existence. To know neither rest nor safety, to face danger every hour, to plow the field with arms piled carefully beside the furrow, to watch every figure that crossed the hillside, in

doubt whether it were foe or friend, to be roused from sleep by the slogan of the highlander or the cry of the borderer as they swept sheep and kye from every homestead in the valley, to bear hunger and thirst and cold and nakedness, to cower within the peel-tower or lurk in the moorland while barn and byre went up in pitiless flame, to mount and ride at a lord's call on forays as pitiless, this was the rough school in which the Scotch peasant was trained through two hundred years. But it was a school in which he learned much. Suffering that would have degraded a meaner race into slaves only hardened and ennobled the temper of the Scotchman. It was from these ages of oppression and lawlessness that he drew the rugged fidelity, the dogged endurance, the shrewdness, the caution, the wariness, the rigid thrift, the noble self-dependence, the patience, the daring, which have distinguished him ever since. Nowhere did the reformation do a grander work than in Scotland, but it was because nowhere were the minds of men so prepared for its work. The soil was ready for the seed. The development of a noble manhood brought with it the craving for a spiritual and a national existence, and at the call of the reformation the Scotch people rose suddenly into a nation and a church.

906. One well-known figure embodied the moral strength of the new movement. In the king's boyhood, amid the wild turmoil which followed on Murray's fall, an old man, bent with years and toil, might have been seen creeping with a secretary's aid to the pulpit of St. Giles. But age and toil were

powerless over the spirit of John Knox. "He believed to leave the pulpit at his first entry; but ere he had done with his sermon he was so active and vigorous that he was like to ding the pulpit into blads and spring out of it." It was in vain that men strove to pen the fiery words of the great preacher. "In the opening up of his text," says a devout listener, "he was moderate; but when he entered into application he made me so grew and tremble that I could not hold a pen to write." What gave its grandeur to the doctrine of Knox was his resolute assertion of a Christian order before which the social and political forces of the world about him shrank into insignificance. The meanest peasant, once called of God, felt within him a strength that was stronger than the might of nobles, and a wisdom that was wiser than the statecraft of kings. In that mighty elevation of the masses, which was embodied in the Calvinist doctrines of election and grace, lay the germs of the modern principles of human equality. The fruits of such a teaching soon showed themselves in a new attitude of the people. "Here," said Melville, over the grave of John Knox, "here lies one who never feared the face of man;" and if Scotland still reverences the memory of the reformer, it is because at that grave her peasant and her trader learned to look in the face of nobles and kings and "not be ashamed."

907. The moral power which Knox created was to express itself through the ecclesiastical forms which had been devised by the genius of Calvin. The new force of popular opinion was concentrated and

formulated in an ordered system of kirk-sessions and presbyteries and provincial synods, while chosen delegates formed the general assembly of the kirk. In this organization of her churches Scotland saw herself for the first time the possessor of a really representative system, of a popular government. In her parliaments the peasant had no voice, the burgher a feeble and unimportant one. They were, in fact, but feudal gatherings of prelates and nobles, whose action was fettered by the precautions of the crown. Of real parliamentary life, such as was seen across the border, not a trace could be found in the assemblies which gathered round the Scottish kings; but a parliamentary life of the keenest and intensest order at once appeared among the lay and spiritual delegates who gathered to the general assembly of the kirk. Not only did Presbyterianism bind Scotland together as it had never been bound before by its administrative organization, but by the power it gave the lay elders in each congregation, and by the summons of laymen in an overpowering majority to the earlier assemblies, it called the people at large to a voice, and as it turned out a decisive voice, in the administration of affairs. If its government by ministers gave it the outer look of an ecclesiastical despotism, no church constitution has proved in practice so democratic as that of Scotland. Its influence in raising the nation at large to a consciousness of its power was shown by the change which passed from the moment of its establishment over the face of Scotch history.

908. The sphere of action to which it called the

people was, in fact, not a mere ecclesiastical but a national sphere. Formally the assembly meddled only with matters of religion; but in the creed of the Calvinist, as in the creed of the Catholic, the secular and the religious world were one. It was the office of the church to enforce good and to rebuke evil; and social and political life fell alike within her "discipline." Feudalism received its death-blow when the noble who had wronged his wife or murdered his tenant sat humbled before the peasant elders on the stool of repentance. The new despotism which was growing up under the form of the monarchy found a sudden arrest in the challenge of the kirk. When James summoned the preachers before his council, and arraigned their meetings as without warrant and seditious, "Mr. Andrew Melville could not abide it, but broke off upon the king in so zealous, powerful, and irresistible a manner that, howbeit, the king used his authority in most crabbed and choleric manner, yet Mr. Andrew bore him down, and uttered the commission, as from the mighty God, calling the king but 'God's silly vassal;' and taking him by the sleeve, says this in effect, though with much hot reasoning and many interruptions; 'Sir, we will humbly reverence your majesty always—namely, in public. But since we have this occasion to be with your majesty in private, and the truth is that you are brought in extreme danger both of your life and crown, and with you the country and kirk of Christ is like to wreck, for not telling you the truth and giving of you a faithful counsel, we must discharge our duty there-

---

in or else be traitors both to Christ and you! And, therefore, sir, as divers times before, so now again I must tell you, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland. There is Christ Jesus the king, and his kingdom the kirk, whose subject James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. And they whom Christ hath called to watch over his kirk and govern his spiritual kingdom have sufficient power and authority so to do both together and severally, the which no Christian king nor prince should control and discharge, but fortify and assist, otherwise not faithful servants nor members of Christ!'"

909. It is idle to set aside words like these as the mere utterances of fanaticism or of priestly arrogance. James and his council would have made swift work of mere fanatics or of arrogant priests. Why Melville could withdraw unharmed was because a people stood behind him, a people suddenly awakened to a consciousness of its will, and stern in the belief that a divine duty lay on it to press that will on its king. Through all the theocratic talk of the Calvinist ministers we see a popular power that fronts the crown. It is the Scotch people that rises into being under the guise of the Scotch kirk. The men who led it were men with no official position or material power, for the nobles had stripped the church of the vast endowments which had lured their sons and the royal bastards within the pale of its ministry. The ministers of the new communion were drawn from the burghers and peasantry, or, at best, from the smaller gentry, and nothing in their

social position aided them in withstanding the nobles or the crown. Their strength lay simply in the popular sympathy behind them, in their capacity of rousing national opinion through the pulpit, of expressing it through the assembly. The claims which such men advanced, ecclesiastical as their garb might be, could not fail to be national in their issues. In struggling against episcopacy, they were, in fact, struggling against any breaking up or impeding of that religious organization which alone enabled Scotland to withstand the claims of the crown. In jealously asserting the right of the general assembly to meet every year and to discuss every question that met it, they were vindicating in the only possible fashion the right of the nation to rule itself in a parliamentary way. In asserting the liberty of the pulpit, they were for the first time in the history of Europe recognizing the power of public opinion and fighting for freedom, whether of thought or of speech. Strange to modern ears as their language may be, bigoted and narrow as their temper must often seem, it is well to remember the greatness of the debt we owe them. It was their stern resolve, their energy, their endurance, that saved Scotland from a civil and religious despotism, and that in saving the liberty of Scotland saved English liberty as well.

910. The greatest of the successors of Knox was Andrew Melville. Two years after Knox's death Melville came fresh from a training among the French Huguenots, to take up and carry forward his work. With less prophetic fire than his master, he

possessed as fierce a boldness, a greater disdain of secular compromises, a lofty pride in his calling, a bigoted faith in Calvinism that knew neither rest nor delay in its full establishment throughout the land. As yet the system of Presbyterian faith and discipline, with the synods and assemblies in which it was embodied, though it had practically won its hold over southern Scotland, was without legal sanction. The demand of the ministers for a restitution of the church lands, and the resolve of the nobles not to part with their spoil, had caused the rejection of the book of discipline by the estates. The same spirit of greed secured the retention of a nominal episcopacy. Though the name of bishops and archbishops appeared "to many to savor of papistry," bishops and archbishops were still named to vacant dioceses as milch-cows through whom the revenues of the sees might be drained by the great nobles. Against such "tulchan-bishops," as they were nicknamed by the people's scorn (a "tulchan" being a mere calf-skin stuffed with hay, by which a cow was persuaded to give her milk after her calf was taken from her), Knox had not cared to protest; he had only taken care that they should be subject to the general assembly, and deprived of all jurisdiction or authority beyond that of a Presbyterian "superintendent." His strong political sense hindered a conflict on such a ground with the civil power, and without a conflict it was plain that no change could come. The regent Morton, Calvinist as he was, supported the cause of episcopacy, and the fact that bishops formed an integral part of the

estates of the realm made any demand for their abolition distasteful to the large mass of men who always shrink from any constitutional revolution.

911. But Melville threw aside all compromise. In 1580 the general assembly declared the office of bishop abolished, as having "no sure warrant, authority, or good ground out of the word of God." In 1581 it adopted a second book of discipline, which organized the church on the pure Calvinistic model, and advanced the full Calvinistic claim to its spiritual independence and supremacy within the realm. When the estates refused to sanction this book the assembly sent it to every presbytery, and its gradual acceptance secured the organization of the church. It was at this crisis that the appearance of Esme Stuart brought about the first reaction toward a revival of the royal power; and the council, under the guidance of the favorite, struck at once at the preachers who denounced it. But their efforts to "tune the pulpits" were met by a bold defiance "Though all the kings of the earth should call my words treason," replied one minister who was summoned to the council-board, "I am ready by good reason to prove them to be the very truth of God, and if need require to seal them with my blood." Andrew Melville, when summoned on the same charge of seditious preaching, laid a Hebrew Bible on the council-table, and "resolved to try conclusions on that only." What the council shrank from "trying conclusions" with was the popular enthusiasm which backed these protests. When John Durie was exiled for words uttered in the

pulpit, the whole town of Edinburgh met him on his return, "and going up the street with bare heads and loud voices, sang to the praise of God till heaven and earth resounded."

912. But it was this very popularity which roused the young king to action. Boy of eighteen as he was, no sooner had the overthrow of the Douglasses and the judicial murder of Lord Gowrie freed James from the power of the nobles than he faced this new foe. Theologically, his opinions were as Calvinistic as those of Melville himself; but in the ecclesiastical fabric of Calvinism, in its organization of the church, in its annual assemblies, in its public discussion and criticism of acts of government through the pulpit, he saw an organized democracy which threatened his crown. And at this he struck as boldly as his forefathers had struck at the power of feudalism. The nobles, dreading the resumption of church lands, were with the king; and in 1584 an act of the estates denounced the judicial and legislative authority assumed by the general assembly, provided that no subjects, temporal or spiritual, "take upon them to convocate or assemble themselves together for holding of councils, conventions, or assemblies," and demanded a pledge of obedience from every minister. For the moment the ministers submitted; and James prepared to carry out his victory by a policy of religious balance. The Catholic lords were still strong in northern and western Scotland; and firmly as the king was opposed to the dogmas of Catholicism, he saw the use he might make of the Catholics as a check on the power of

the congregation. It was with this view that he shielded Lord Huntly and the Catholic nobles while he intrigued with the Guises abroad. But such a policy at such a juncture forced England to intervene. At a moment when the Armada was gathering in the Tagus, Elizabeth felt the need of securing Scotland against any revival of Catholicism; and her aid enabled the exiled lords to return in triumph in 1585. For the next ten years James was helpless in their hands. He was forced to ally himself with Elizabeth, to offer aid against the Armada, to make a Protestant marriage, to threaten action against Philip, to attack Huntly and the Catholic lords of the north on a charge of correspondence with Spain, and to drive them from the realm. The triumph of the Protestant lords was a triumph of the kirk. In 1592 the acts of 1584 were repealed; episcopacy was formally abolished and the Calvinistic organization of the church at last received legal sanction. All that James could save was the right of being present at the general assembly, and of fixing a time and place for its annual meeting. It was in vain that the young king struggled and argued; in vain that he resolutely asserted himself to be supreme in spiritual as in civil matters; in vain that he showed himself a better scholar and a more learned theologian than the men who held him down. The preachers scolded him from the pulpit, and bade him "to his knees" to seek pardon for his vanity; while the assembly chided him for his "banning and swearing," and sent a deputation to confer with his queen touching the "want of godly exercise among her maids."

918. The bitter memory of these years of humiliation dwelt with James to the last. They were fiercely recalled when he mounted the English throne. "A Scottish presbytery," he exclaimed at the Hampton Court conference, "as well fitteth with monarchy as God and the devil." Year after year he watched for the hour of deliverance, and every year brought it nearer. His mother's death gave fresh strength to his throne. The alliance with England, Elizabeth's pledge not to oppose his succession, left him practically heir of the English crown. Freed from the dread of a Catholic reaction, the queen was at liberty to indulge in her dread of Calvinism, and to sympathize with the fresh struggle which James was preparing to make against it. Her attitude, as well as the growing certainty of his coming greatness as sovereign of both realms, had no doubt their influence in again strengthening the king's position; and his new power was seen in his renewed mastery over the Scottish lords. But this triumph over feudalism was only the opening of a decisive struggle with Calvinism. If he had defeated Huntly and his fellow-plotters, he refused to keep them in exile or to comply with the demand of the church that he should refuse their services on the ground of religion. He would be king of a nation, he contended, and not of a part of it. The protest was a fair one; but the real secret of the king's policy toward the Catholics, as of his son's after him, was a "king-craft" which aimed at playing off one part of the nation against another to the profit of the crown. "The wisdom of the council,"

said a defiant preacher, "is this, that ye must be served with all sorts of men to serve your purpose and grandeur, Jew and Gentile, Papist and Protestant. And because the ministers and Protestants in Scotland are over strong and control the king, they must be weakened and brought low."

914. It was with this end before him that James set finally to work in 1597. Cool, adroit, firm in his purpose, the young king seized on some wild outbreaks of the pulpit to assert a control over its utterances; a riot in Edinburgh in defense of the ministers enabled him to bring the town to submission by flooding its streets with highlanders and borderers; the general assembly itself was made amenable to royal influence by its summons to Perth, where the cooler temper of the northern ministers could be played off against the hot Presbyterianism of the ministers of the Lothians. It was the assembly itself which consented to curtail the liberty of preaching and the liberty of assembling in presbytery and synod, as well as to make the king's consent needful for the appointment of every minister. What James was as stubbornly resolved on was the restoration of episcopacy. He wished not only to bridle but to rule the church; and it was only through bishops that he could effectively rule it. The old tradition of the Stuarts had looked to the prelates for the support of the crown, and James saw keenly that the new force which had overthrown them was a force which threatened to overthrow the monarchy itself. It was the people which, in its religious or its political guise, was the assailant of both. And as their foe

was the same, so James argued, with the shrewd short-sightedness of his race, their cause was the same. "No bishop," ran his famous adage, "no king!" To restore the episcopate was from this moment his steady policy. But its actual restoration only followed on the failure of a long attempt to bring the assembly round to a project of nominating representatives of itself in the estates. The presence of such representatives would have strengthened the moral weight of the parliament, while it diminished that of the assembly, and in both ways would have tended to the advantage of the crown. But cowed as the ministers now were, no pressure could bring them to do more than name delegates to vote according to their will in the estates; and as such a plan foiled the king's scheme, James was at last driven to use a statute which empowered him to name bishops as prelates with a seat in the estates, though they possessed no spiritual status or jurisdiction. In 1600 two such prelates appeared in parliament; and James followed up his triumph by the publication of his "*Basilicon Dôron*," an assertion of the divine right and absolute authority of kings over all orders of men within their realms.

915. It is only by recalling the early history of James Stuart that we can realize the attitude and temper of the Scottish sovereign at the moment when the death of Elizabeth called him to the English throne. He came flushed with a triumph over Calvinism and democracy, but embittered by the humiliations he had endured from them, and dreading them as the deadly enemies of his crown. Raised at last

to a greatness of which he had hardly dreamed, he was little likely to yield to a pressure, whether religious or political, against which, in his hour of weakness, he had fought so hard. Hopes of ecclesiastical change found no echo in a king whose ears were still thrilling with the defiance of Melville and his fellow-ministers, and who, among all the charms that England presented to him, saw none so attractive as its ordered and obedient church, its synods that met but at the royal will, its courts that carried out the royal ordinances, its bishops that held themselves to be royal officers. Nor were the hopes of political progress likely to meet with a warmer welcome. Politics with a Stuart meant simply a long struggle for the exaltation of the crown. It was a struggle where success had been won, not by a reverence for law or a people's support, but by sheer personal energy, by a blind faith in monarchy and the rights of monarchy, by an unscrupulous use of every weapon which a king possessed. Craft had been met by craft, violence by violence. Justice had been degraded into a weapon in the royal hand. The sacredness of law had disappeared in a strife where all seemed lawful for the preservation of the crown. By means such as these feudalism had been humbled and the long strife with the baronage brought at last to a close. Strife with the people had yet to be waged. But in whatever forms it might present itself, whether in his new land or his old, it would be waged by James as by his successors in the same temper and with the same belief, a belief that the welfare of the nation lay in the unchecked su-

premacý of the crown, and a temper that held all means lawful for the establishment of such a supremacy.

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE BREAK WITH THE PARLIAMENT.

1603—1611.

916. ON the 6th of May, 1603, after a stately progress through his new dominions, King James entered London. In outer appearance no sovereign could have jarred more utterly against the conception of an English ruler which had grown up under Plantagenet or Tudor. His big head, his slobbering tongue, his quilted clothes, his rickety legs stood out in as grotesque a contrast with all that men recalled of Henry or Elizabeth as his gabble and rhodomontade, his want of personal dignity, his buffoonery, his coarseness of speech, his pedantry, his personal cowardice. Under this ridiculous exterior, indeed, lay no small amount of moral courage and of intellectual ability. James was a ripe scholar, with a considerable fund of shrewdness, of mother-wit, and ready repartee. His canny humor lights up the political and theological controversies of the time with quaint, incisive phrases, with puns and epigrams and touches of irony which still retain their savor. His reading, especially in theological matters, was extensive; and he was already a voluminous author on subjects which ranged from predestination to tobacco. But his shrewdness and learning

only left him, in the phrase of Henry the Fourth of France, "the wisest fool in Christendom." He had, in fact, the temper of a pedant, a pedant's conceit, a pedant's love of theories, and a pedant's inability to bring his theories into any relation with actual facts. It was this fatal defect that marred his political abilities. As a statesman he had shown no little capacity in his smaller realm; his cool humor and good temper had held even Melville at bay; he had known how to wait and how to strike; and his patience and boldness had been rewarded with a fair success. He had studied foreign affairs as busily as he had studied Scotch affairs; and of the temper and plans of foreign courts he probably possessed a greater knowledge than any Englishman save Robert Cecil. But what he never possessed, and what he never could gain, was any sort of knowledge of England or Englishmen. He came to his new home a Scotchman, a foreigner, strange to the life, the thoughts, the traditions, of the English people. And he remained strange to them to the last. A younger man might have insensibly imbibed the temper of the men about him. A man of genius would have flung himself into the new world of thought and feeling and made it his own. But James was neither young nor a man of genius. He was already in middle age when he crossed the border; and his cleverness and his conceit alike blinded him to the need of any adjustment of his conclusions or his prejudices to the facts which fronted him.

917. It was this estrangement from the world of thought and feeling about them which gave its

peculiar color to the rule of the Stuarts. It was not the first time that England had submitted to foreign kings. But it was the first time that England experienced a foreign rule. Foreign notions of religion, foreign maxims of state, foreign conceptions of the attitude of the people or the nobles toward the crown, foreign notions of the relation of the crown to the people, formed the policy of James as of his successors. For the Stuarts remained foreigners to the last. Their line filled the English throne for more than eighty years; but, like the Bourbons, they forgot nothing and they learned nothing. To all influences, indeed, save English influences they were accessible enough. As James was steeped in the traditions of Scotland, so Charles the First was open to the traditions of Spain. The second Charles and the second James reflected in very different ways the temper of France. But what no Stuart seemed able to imbibe or to reflect was the temper of England. The strange medley of contradictory qualities which blended in the English character, its love of liberty and its love of order, its prejudice and open-mindedness, its religious enthusiasm and its cool good sense, remained alike unintelligible to them. And as they failed to understand England, so in many ways England failed to understand them. It underrated their ability, nor did it do justice to their aims. Its insular temper found no hold on a policy which was far more European than insular. Its practical sense recoiled from the unpractical cleverness that, while it seldom said a foolish thing, yet never did a wise one.

918. From the first, this severance between English feeling and the feeling of the king was sharply marked. If war and taxation had dimmed the popularity of Elizabeth in her later years, England had still a reverence for the queen who had made her great. But James was hardly over the border when he was heard expressing his scorn of the character and statecraft of his predecessor. Her policy, whether at home or abroad, he came resolved to undo. Men who had fought side by side with Dutchman and Huguenot against Spaniard and leaguer heard angrily that the new king was seeking for peace with Spain, that he was negotiating with the papacy, while he met the advances of France with a marked coolness, and denounced the Hollanders as rebels against their king. It was with scarcely less anger that they saw the stern system of repression which had prevailed through the close of Elizabeth's reign relaxed in favor of the Catholics, and recusants released from the payments of fines. It was clear that both at home and abroad James purposed to withdraw from that struggle with Catholicism which the hotter Protestants looked upon as a battle for God. What the king really aimed at was the security of his throne. The Catholics alone questioned his title; and a formal excommunication by Rome would have roused them to dispute his accession. James had averted this danger by intrigues both with the papal court and the English Catholics during the later years of Elizabeth; and his vague assurances had mystified the one and prevented the others from acting. The disappointment of the Catholics when no

change followed on the king's accession found vent in a wild plot for the seizure of his person, devised by a priest named Watson; and the alarm this created quickened James to a redemption of his pledges. In July, 1603, the leading Catholics were called before the council and assured that the fines for recusancy would no longer be exacted; while an attempt was made to open a negotiation with Rome and to procure the support of the pope for the new government. But the real strength of the Catholic party lay in the chance of aid from Spain. So long as the war continued they would look to Spain for succor, and the influence of Spain would be exerted to keep them in antagonism to the crown. Nor was this the only ground for a cessation of hostilities. The temper of James was peaceful; the royal treasury was exhausted; and the continuance of the war necessitated a close connection with the Calvinistic and republican Hollanders. At the same time, therefore, that the Catholics were assured of a relaxation of the penal laws, negotiations for peace were opened with Spain.

919. However justifiable such steps might be, it was certain that they would rouse alarm and discontent among the sterner Protestants. For a time, however, it seemed as if concessions on one side were to be balanced by concessions on the other, as if the tolerance which had been granted to the Catholic would be extended to the Puritan. James had hardly crossed the border when he was met by what was termed the millenary petition, from a belief that it was signed by 1,000 of the English

clergy. It really received the assent of some 800, or of about a tenth of the clergy of the realm. The petitioners asked for no change in the government or organization of the church, but for a reform of its courts, the removal of superstitious usages from the book of common prayer, the disuse of lessons from the apocryphal books of Scripture, a more rigorous observance of Sundays, and the provision and training of ministers who could preach to the people. Concessions on these points would as yet have satisfied the bulk of the Puritans; and for a while it seemed as if concession was purposed. The king not only received the petition, but promised a conference of bishops and divines in which it should be discussed. Ten months, however, were suffered to pass before the pledge was redeemed; and a fierce protest from the university of Oxford in the interval gave little promise of a peaceful settlement. The university denounced the Puritan demands as preludes of a Presbyterian system in which the clergy would "have power to bind their king in chains and their prince in links of iron, that is (in their learning) to censure him, to enjoin him penance, to excommunicate him, yea—in case they see cause—to proceed against him as a tyrant."

920. The warning was hardly needed by James. The voice of Melville was still in his ears when he summoned four Puritan ministers to meet the archbishop and eight of his suffragans at Hampton Court in January, 1604. From the first he showed no purpose of discussing the grievances alleged in the petition. He reveled in the opportunity for a

display of his theological reading; but he viewed the Puritan demands in a purely political light. He charged the petitioners with aiming at a Scottish presbytery, "where Jack and Tom and Will and Dick shall meet, and at their pleasure censure me and my council and all their proceedings. Stay," he went on with amusing vehemence,—“stay, I pray you, for one seven years before you demand that from me, and if you find me pursy and fat and my windpipe stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you, for let that government be once up and I am sure I shall be kept in health.” No words could have better shown the new king’s unconsciousness that he had passed into a land where parliaments were realities, and where the “censure” of king and council was a national tradition. But neither his theology nor his politics met with any protest from the prelates about him. On the contrary, the bishops declared that the insults James showered on their opponents were inspired by the Holy Ghost. The Puritans, however, still ventured to question his infallibility, and the king broke up the conference with a threat which disclosed the policy of the crown. “I will make them conform,” he said of the remonstrants, “or I will harry them out of the land!”

921. It is only when we recall the temper of England at the time that we can understand the profound emotion which was roused by threats such as these. Three months after the conference at Hampton Court the members were gathering to the first parliament of the new reign; and the parliament of

1604 met in another mood from that of any parliament which had met for a hundred years. Under the Tudors the houses had more than once at great crises in our history withstood the policy of the crown. But, in the main, that policy had been their own; and it was the sense of this oneness in aim which had averted any final collision even in the strife with Elizabeth. But this trust in the unity of the nation and the crown was now roughly shaken. The squires and merchants who thronged the benches at Westminster listened with coolness and suspicion to the self-confident assurances of the king. "I bring you," said James, "two gifts, one peace with foreign nations, the other union with Scotland;" and a project was laid before them for a union of the two kingdoms under the name of "Great Britain." "By what laws," asked Bacon, "shall this Britain be governed?" Great, in fact, as were the advantages of such a scheme, the house showed its sense of the political difficulties involved in it by referring it to a commission. James, in turn, showed his resentment by passing over the attempts made to commute for a fixed sum the oppressive rights of purveyance and wardship. But what the house was really set upon was religious reform; and the first step of the commons had been the naming of a committee to frame bills for the redress of the more crying ecclesiastical grievances. The influence of the crown secured the rejection of these bills by the lords; and the irritation of the lower house showed itself in an outspoken address to the king. The parliament, it said, had come together in a

spirit of peace. "Our desires were of peace only, and our device of unity." Their aim had been to put an end to the long-standing dissension among the ministers, and to preserve uniformity by the abandonment of "a few ceremonies of small importance," by the redress of some ecclesiastical abuses, and by the establishment of an efficient training for a preaching clergy. If they had waived their right to deal with these matters during the old age of Elizabeth, they asserted it now. "Let your majesty be pleased to receive public information from your commons in parliament, as well of the abuses in the church as in the civil state and government." Words yet bolder, and which sound like a prelude to the petition of right, met the claim of absolutism which was so frequently on the new king's lips. "Your majesty would be misinformed," said the address, "if any man should deliver that the kings of England have any absolute power in themselves, either to alter religion or to make any laws concerning the same, otherwise than as in temporal causes by consent of parliament."

922. The address was met by a petulant scolding, and as the commons met coldly the king's request for a subsidy, the houses were adjourned. James at once assumed the title, to which parliament had deferred its assent, of King of Great Britain; while the support of the crown emboldened the bishops to a fresh defiance of the Puritan pressure. The act of Elizabeth which gave parliamentary sanction to the thirty-nine articles compelled ministers to subscribe only to those which concerned the faith and the

sacraments, and thus implicitly refused to compel their signatures to the articles which related to points of discipline and church government. The compromise had been observed from 1571 till now; but the convocation of 1604, by its canons, required the subscription of the clergy to the articles touching rites and ceremonies. The king showed his approval of this step by raising its prime mover, Bancroft, to the vacant see of Canterbury; and Bancroft added to the demand of subscription a requirement of rigid conformity with the rubrics on the part of all beneficed clergymen. In the spring of 1605 three hundred of the Puritan clergy were driven from their livings for a refusal to comply with these demands.

923. If James had come to his new throne with dreams of conciliation and of a greater unity among his subjects, his dream was to be speedily dispelled. At the moment when the persecution of Bancroft announced a final breach between the crown and the Puritans, a revival of the old rigor made a fresh breach between the crown and the Catholics. In remitting the fines for recusancy James had never purposed to suffer any revival of Catholicism; and in the opening of 1604 a proclamation which bade all Jesuits and seminary priests depart from the land proved that on its political side the Elizabethan policy was still adhered to. But the effect of the remission of fines was at once to swell the numbers of avowed Catholics. In the diocese of Chester the number of recusants increased by a thousand. Rumors of Catholic conversions spread a panic

which showed itself in an act of the parliament of 1604 confirming the statutes of Elizabeth; and to this James gave his assent. He promised, indeed, that the statute should remain inoperative; but rumors of his own conversion, which sprang from his secret negotiation with Rome, so angered the king that in the spring of 1605 he bade the judges put it in force, while the fines for recusancy were levied more strictly than before. The disappointment of their hopes, the quick breach of the pledges so solemnly given to them, drove the Catholics to despair. They gave fresh life to a conspiracy which a small knot of bigots had been fruitlessly striving to bring to an issue since the king's accession. Catesby, a Catholic zealot who had taken part in the rising of Essex, had busied himself during the last years of Elizabeth in preparing for a revolt at the queen's death, and in seeking for his project the aid of Spain. He was joined in his plans by two fellow-zealots, Winter and Wright; but the scheme was still unripe when James peaceably mounted the throne; and for the moment his pledge of toleration put an end to it. But the zeal of the plotters was revived by the banishment of the priests; and the conspiracy at last took the form of a plan for blowing up both houses of parliament and profiting by the terror caused by such a stroke. In Flanders Catesby found a new assistant in his schemes, Guido Fawkes, an Englishman who was serving in the army of the archduke; and on his return to England he was joined by Thomas Percy, a cousin of the Earl of Northumberland and a pensioner of the king's guard. In May,

1604, the little group hired a tenement near the parliament house, and set themselves to dig a mine beneath its walls.

924. As yet, however, they stood alone. The bulk of the Catholics were content with the relaxation of the penal laws; and in the absence of any aid the plotters were forced to suspend their work. It was not till the sudden change in the royal policy that their hopes revived. But with the renewal of persecution Catesby at once bestirred himself; and at the close of 1604 the lucky discovery of a cellar beneath the parliament house facilitated the execution of this plan. Barrels of gunpowder were placed in the cellar, and the little group waited patiently for the 5th of November, 1605, when the houses were again summoned to assemble. In the interval their plans widened into a formidable conspiracy. It was arranged that on the destruction of the king and the parliament the Catholics should rise, seize the young princes, use the general panic to make themselves masters of the realm, and call for aid from the Spaniards in Flanders. With this view Catholics of greater fortune, such as Sir Everard Digby and Francis Tresham, were admitted to Catesby's confidence, and supplied money for the larger projects he designed. Arms were bought in Flanders, horses were held in readiness, a meeting of Catholic gentlemen was brought about under show of a hunting party to serve as the beginning of a rising. Wonderful as was the secrecy with which the plot was concealed, the cowardice of Tresham at the last moment gave a clue to it by a letter to Lord Monteagle, his

relative, which warned him to absent himself from the parliament on the fatal day; and further information brought about the discovery of the cellar and of Guido Fawkes, who was charged with its custody. The hunting party broke up in despair; the conspirators, chased from county to county, were either killed or sent to the block; and Garnet, the provincial of the English Jesuits, was brought to trial and executed. Though he had shrunk from all part in the plot, its existence had been made known to him by another Jesuit, Greenway; and horror-stricken as he represented himself to have been, he had kept the secret and left the parliament to its doom.

925. The failure of such a plot necessarily gives strength to a government; and for the moment the parliament was drawn closer to the king by the deliverance from a common peril. When the houses again met in 1606 they listened in a different temper to the demand for a subsidy. The needs of the treasury, indeed, were great. Elizabeth had left behind her a war expenditure, and a debt of £400,000. The first ceased with the peace, but the debt remained; and the prodigality of James was fast raising the charges of the crown in time of peace to as high a level as they had reached under his predecessor in time of war. The commons voted a sum which was large enough to meet the royal debt. The fixed charges of the crown, they held, should be met by its ordinary revenues; but James had no mind to bring his expenditure down to the level of Elizabeth's. The growth of English commerce offered a means of recruiting his treasury, which seemed to

lie within the limits of customary law; and of this he availed himself. The right of the crown to levy impositions on exports and imports other than those of wool, leather, and tin had been the last financial prerogative for which the Edwards had struggled. They had been forced, indeed, to abandon it; but the tradition of such a right lingered on at the royal council-board; and under the Tudors the practice had been to some slight extent revived. A duty on imports had been imposed in one or two instances by Mary, and this impost had been extended by Elizabeth to currants and wine. These instances, however, were too trivial and exceptional to break in upon the general usage; but a more dangerous precedent had been growing up in the duties which the great trading companies, such as those to the Levant and to the Indies, were allowed to exact from merchants, in exchange—as was held—for the protection they afforded them in far-off and dangerous seas. The Levant Company was now dissolved, and James seized on the duties it had levied as lapsing naturally to the crown.

926. The parliament at once protested against these impositions; but the prospect of a fresh struggle with the commons told less with the king than the prospect of a revenue which might free him from dependence on the commons altogether. His fanatical belief in the rights and power of the crown hindered all sober judgment of such a question. James cared quite as much to assert his absolute authority as to fill his treasury. In the course of 1606, therefore, the case of a Levant merchant called

Bates, who refused to pay the imposition, was brought before the exchequer chamber. The judgment of the court justified the king's confidence in his claim. It went far beyond the original bounds of the case itself, of the right of the crown to levy on the ground of protection the due which had been levied on that ground by the leading companies. It asserted the king's right to levy what customs duties he would. "All customs," said the judges, "are the effects of foreign commerce; but all affairs of commerce and treaties with foreign nations belong to the king's absolute power. He, therefore, who has power over the cause has power over the effect." The importance of such a decision could hardly be overrated. English commerce was growing fast. English merchants were fighting their way to the Spice Islands, and establishing settlements in the dominions of the Mogul. The judgment gave James a revenue which was certain to grow rapidly, and whose growth would go far to free the crown from any need of resorting for supplies to parliament.

927. But no immediate step was taken to give effect to the judgment; and the commons contented themselves with a protest against impositions at the close of the session of 1606. When they reassembled in the following year their attention was absorbed by the revival of the questions which sprang from the new relations of Scotland to England through their common king. There was now no question of a national union. The commission to which the whole matter had been referred had reported in favor of the abolition of hostile laws, the

establishment of a general free trade between the two kingdoms, and the naturalization as Englishmen of all living Scotchmen who had been born before the king's accession to the English throne. The judges had already given their opinion that all born after it were naturalized Englishmen by force of their allegiance to a sovereign who had become king of England. The constitutional danger of such a theory was easily seen. Had the marriage of Philip and Mary produced a son, every Spaniard and every Fleming would under it have counted as Englishmen, and England would have been absorbed in the mass of the Spanish monarchy. The opinion of the judges, in fact, implied that nationality hung not on the existence of the nation itself, but on its relation to a king. It was to escape from such a theory that the commons asked that the question should be waived, and offered on that condition to naturalize all Scotchmen whatever by statute. But James would not assent. To him the assertion of a right inherent in the crown was far dearer than a peaceful settlement of the matter; the bills for free trade were dropped; and on the adjournment of the houses a case was brought before the exchequer chamber; and the naturalization of the "post-nati," as Scots born after the king's accession were styled, established by a formal judgment.

928. James had won a victory for his prerogative; but he had won it at the cost of Scotland. To the smaller and poorer kingdom the removal of all obstacles to her commerce with England would have been an inestimable gain. The intercourse which

it would have necessitated could hardly have failed in time to bring about a more perfect union. But as the king's reign drew on, the union of the two realms seemed more distant than ever. Bacon's shrewd question, "Under which laws is this Britain to be governed?" took fresh meaning as men saw James asserting in Scotland an all but absolute authority and breaking down the one constitutional check which had hitherto hampered him. The energy which he had shown in his earlier combat with the democratic forces embodied in the kirk was not likely to slacken on his accession to the southern throne. It was in the general assembly that the new force of public opinion took legislative and administrative form; and even before he crossed the border, James had succeeded in asserting a right to convene and be personally present at the proceedings of the general assembly. But once king of England, he could venture on heavier blows. In spite of his assent to an act legalizing its annual convention, James hindered any meeting of the general assembly for five successive years by repeated prorogations. The protests of the clergy were roughly met. When nineteen ministers appeared in 1605 at Aberdeen, and, in defiance of the prorogation, constituted themselves an assembly, they were called before the council, and, on refusal to own its jurisdiction, banished as traitors from the realm. Of the leaders who remained, the boldest were summoned in 1606, with Andrew Melville, to confer with the king in England on his projects of change. On their refusal to betray the freedom of the church they were committed

to prison; and an epigram which Melville wrote on the usages of the English communion was seized on as a ground for bringing him before the English privy council with Bancroft at its head. But the insolence of the primate fell on ears less patient than those of the Puritans he had insulted at Hampton Court. As he stood at the council-table, Melville seized the archbishop by the sleeves of his rochet, and, shaking them in his manner, called them popish rags and marks of the beast. He was sent to the Tower, and released after some years of imprisonment only to go into exile.

929. The trial of Scotchmen before a foreign court, the imprisonment of Scotchmen in foreign prisons, were steps that showed the powerlessness of James to grasp the first principles of law; but they were effective for the purpose at which he aimed. They struck terror into the Scotch ministers. Their one weapon lay in the enthusiasm of the people; but, strongly as Scotch enthusiasm might tell on a king at Edinburgh, it was powerless over a king at London. The time had come when James might pass on from merely silencing the general assembly to the use of it in the enslavement of the church. Successful as he had been in gagging the pulpits and silencing the assembly, he had been as yet less successful in his efforts to revive the power of the crown over the church by a restoration of episcopacy. He had nominated a few bishops, and had won back for them their old places in parliament; but his bishops remained purely secular nobles, unrecognized in their spiritual capacity by the church,

and without any ecclesiastical jurisdiction. It was in vain that James had striven to bring Melville and his fellows to any recognition of prelacy. But with their banishment and imprisonment the field was clear for more vigorous action. Deprived of their leaders, threatened with bonds and exile, deserted by the nobles, ill supported as yet by the mass of the people, to whom the real nature of their struggle was unknown, the Scotch ministers bent at last before the pressure of the crown. They still shrank, indeed, from any formal acceptance of episcopacy; but they allowed the bishops to act as perpetual moderators or presidents in the synods of their presbyteries.

930. With such moderators, the general assembly might be suffered to meet. Their influence, in fact, secured the return of royal nominees to assemblies which met in 1608 and in 1610; and in the second of these assemblies episcopacy was at last formally recognized by the Scottish church. The bishops were owned as permanent heads of each provincial synod; the power of ordination was committed to them; the ecclesiastical sentences pronounced by synod or presbytery were henceforth to be submitted for their approval. The new organization of the church was at once carried out. The vacant sees were filled. Two archbishops were created at St. Andrew's and Glasgow, and set at the head of courts of high commission for their respective provinces; while three of the prelates were sent to receive consecration in England, and on their return communicated it to their fellow-bishops. With such a measure of suc-

cess James was fairly content. The prelacy he had revived fell far short of English episcopacy; to the eyes of religious dogmatists such as Laud, indeed, it seemed little better than the Presbyterianism it superseded. But the aim of James was political rather than religious. He had no dislike for Presbyterianism as a system of church government; what he dreaded was the popular force to which it gave form in its synods and assemblies, and which, in the guise of ecclesiastical independence, was lifting the nation into equality with the crown. In seizing on the control of the church through his organized prelacy, James held himself to have seized the control of the forces which acted through the church, and to have won back that mastery of his realm which the reformation had reft from the Scottish kings.

931. What he had really done was to commit the Scotch crown to a lasting struggle with the religious impulses of the Scottish people. The cause of episcopacy was ruined by his triumph. Belief in bishops ceased to be possible for a Scotchman when bishops were forced on Scotland as mere tools of the royal will. Presbyterianism, on the other hand, became identified with patriotism. It was no longer an ecclesiastical system; it was the guise under which national freedom and even national existence were to struggle against an arbitrary rule—against a rule which grew more and more the rule of a foreign king. Nor was the sight of the royal triumph lost on the southern realm. England had no love for presbyters or hatred for bishops; but as she saw

the last check on the royal authority broken down over the border she looked the more jealously at the effort which James was making to break down such checks at home. Under Elizabeth, proclamations had been sparingly used, and for the most part only to enforce what was already the law. Not only was their number multiplied under James, but their character was changed. They created new offences, imposed new penalties, and directed offenders to be brought before courts which had no legal jurisdiction over them. To narrow, indeed, the sphere of the common law seemed the special aim of the royal policy; the four counties of the western border had been severed from the rest of England and placed under the jurisdiction of the president and council of Wales, a court whose constitution and procedure rested on the sheer will of the crown. The province of the spiritual courts was as busily enlarged. It was in vain that the judges, spurred no doubt by the old jealousy between civil and ecclesiastical lawyers, entertained appeals against the high commission, and strove by a series of decisions to set bounds to its limitless claims of jurisdiction or to restrict its powers of imprisonment to cases of schism and heresy. The judges were powerless against the crown; and James was vehement in his support of courts which were closely bound up with his own prerogative. What work the courts spiritual might be counted on to do, if the king had his way, was plain from the announcement of a civilian named Cowell that "the king is above law by his absolute power," and that, "notwithstanding his oath, he may alter and sus-

pend any particular law that seemeth hurtful to the public estate."

932. Cowell's book was suppressed on a remonstrance of the house of commons; but the party of passive obedience grew fast. Even before his accession to the English throne, James had formulated his theory of rule in a work on "The True Law of Free Monarchy," and announced that, "although a good king will frame his actions to be according to law, yet he is not bound thereto, but of his own will and for example giving to his subjects." With the Tudor statesmen who used the phrase, "an absolute king" or "an absolute monarchy" meant a sovereign or rule complete in themselves, and independent of all foreign or papal interference. James chose to regard the words as implying the freedom of the monarch from all control by law or from responsibility to anything but his own royal will. The king's theory was already a system of government; it was soon to become a doctrine which bishops preached from the pulpit, and for which brave men laid their heads on the block. The church was quick to adopt its sovereign's discovery. Some three years after his accession, convocation, in its book of canons, denounced as a fatal error the assertion that "all civil power, jurisdiction, and authority were first derived from the people and disordered multitude, or either is originally still in them, or else is deduced by their consent, naturally from them; and is not God's ordinance originally descending from him, and depending upon him." In strict accordance with the royal theory these doctors declared sover-

eignty in its origin to be the prerogative of birth-right, and inculcated passive obedience to the crown as a religious obligation. The doctrine of passive obedience was soon taught in the schools. A few years before the king's death the university of Oxford decreed solemnly that "it was in no case lawful for subjects to make use of force against their princes, or to appear offensively or defensively in the field against them." But what gave most force to such teaching were the reiterated expressions of James himself. If the king's "arrogant speeches" woke resentment in the parliaments to which they were addressed, they created by sheer force of repetition a certain amount of belief in the arbitrary power they challenged for the crown. One sentence from a speech delivered in the star-chamber may serve as an instance of their tone. "As it is atheism and blasphemy to dispute what God can do, so," said James, "it is presumption and a high contempt in a subject to dispute what a king can do, or to say that a king cannot do this or that."

983. "If the practice follow the positions," commented a thoughtful observer on words such as these, "we are not likely to leave to our successors the freedom we received from our forefathers." Their worst effect was in changing the whole attitude of the nation toward the crown. England had trusted the Tudors, it distrusted the Stuarts. The mood, indeed, both of king and people, had grown to be a mood of jealousy, of suspicion, which, inevitable as it was, often did injustice to the purpose of both. King James looked on the squires and mer-

chants of the house of commons as his Stuart predecessors had looked on the Scotch baronage. He regarded their discussions, their protests, their delays, not as the natural hesitation of men called suddenly, and with only half knowledge, to the settlement of great and complex questions, but as proofs of a conspiracy to fetter and impede the action of the crown. The commons, on the other hand, listened to the king's hectoring speeches not as the chance talk of a clever and garrulous theorist, but as proofs of a settled purpose to change the character of the monarchy. In a word, James had succeeded in some seven years of rule in breaking utterly down that mutual understanding between the crown and its subjects on which all government, save a sheer despotism, must necessarily rest.

934. It was this mutual distrust which brought about the final breach between the parliament and the king. The question of the impositions had seemed for a while to have been waived. The commons had contented themselves with a protest against their levy. James had for two years hesitated in acting on the judgment which asserted his right to levy them. But the needs of the treasury became too great to admit of further hesitation, and in 1608 a royal proclamation imposed customs duties on many articles of import and export. The new duties came in fast; but unluckily the royal debt grew faster. To a king fresh from the penniless exchequer of Holyrood, the wealth of England seemed boundless; money was lavished on court-feasts and favorites; and with each year the expenditure of James

reached a higher level. It was in vain that Robert Cecil took the treasury into his own hands and strove to revive the frugal traditions of Elizabeth. The king's prodigality undid his minister's work; and in 1610 Cecil was forced to announce to his master that the annual revenue of the crown must be supplemented by fresh grants from parliament. The scheme which Cecil laid before the king and the commons is of great importance as the last effort of that Tudor policy which had so long hindered an outbreak of strife between the nation and the crown. Differ as the Tudors might from one another, they were alike in their keen sense of national feeling and in their craving to carry it along with them. Masterful as Henry or Elizabeth might be, what they "prized most dearly," as the queen confessed, was "the love and good-will of their subjects." They prized it because they knew the force it gave them. And Cecil knew it too. He had grown up among the traditions of the Tudor rule. He had been trained by his father in the system of Elizabeth. Whether as a minister of the queen or as a minister of her successor, he had striven to carry that system into effect. His conviction of the supremacy of the crown was as strong as that of James himself, but it was tempered by as strong a conviction of the need of the national good-will. He had seen what weight the passionate enthusiasm that gathered round Elizabeth gave to her policy both at home and abroad; and he saw that a time was drawing near when the same weight would be needed by the policy of the crown.

935. Slowly, but steadily, the clouds of religious strife were gathering over central Europe. From such a strife, should it once break out in war, England could not hold aloof unless the tradition of its policy was wholly set aside. And so long as Cecil lived, whatever change might take place at home, in all foreign affairs the Elizabethan policy was mainly adhered to. Peace, indeed, was made with Spain; but a close alliance with the united provinces, and a more guarded alliance with France, held the ambition of Spain in check almost as effectually as war. The peace, in fact, set England free to provide against dangers which threatened to become greater than those from Spanish aggression in the Netherlands. Wearily as war in that quarter might drag on, it was clear that the Dutchmen could hold their own, and that all that Spain and Catholicism could hope for was to save the rest of the Low Countries from their grasp. But no sooner was danger from the Spanish branch of the house of Austria at an end than Protestantism had to guard itself against its German branch. The vast possessions of Charles the Fifth had been parted between his brother and his son. While Philip took Spain, Italy, the Netherlands, and the Indies, Ferdinand took the German dominions, the hereditary duchy of Austria, the Suabian lands, Tyrol, Styria, Carinthia, Carniola. Marriage and fortune brought to the German branch the dependent states of Hungary, Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia; and it had succeeded in retaining the imperial crown. The wisdom and moderation of Ferdinand and his successor secured tranquillity for Ger-

many through some fifty years. They were faithful to the peace of Passau, which had been wrested by Maurice of Saxony from Charles the Fifth, and which secured both Protestants and Catholics in the rights and possessions which they held at the moment it was made. Their temper was tolerant; and they looked on quietly while Protestantism spread over southern Germany and solved all doubtful questions which arose from the treaty in its own favor. The peace had provided that all church land already secularized should remain so; of the later secularization of other church land it said nothing. It provided that states already Protestant should abide so, but it said nothing of the right of other states to declare themselves Protestant. Doubt, however, was set aside by religious zeal; new states became Lutheran, and eight great bishoprics of the north were secularized. Meanwhile the new faith was spreading fast over the dominions of the house of Austria. The nobles of their very duchy embraced it; Moravia, Silesia, Hungary, all but wholly abandoned Catholicism. Through the earlier reign of Elizabeth it seemed as if by a peaceful progress of conversion Germany was about to become Protestant. 1586. German Catholicism was saved by the Catholic revival and by the energy of the Jesuits. It was saved perhaps as much by the strife which broke out in the heart of German Protestantism between Lutheran and Calvinist. But the Catholic zealots were far from resting content with having checked the advance of their opponents. They longed to undo their work. They did not question the treaty

of Passau or the settlement made by it; but they disputed the Protestant interpretation of its silences; they called for the restoration to Catholicism of all church lands secularized, of all states converted from the older faith, since its conclusion. Their new attitude woke little terror in the Lutheran states. The treaty secured their rights, and their position in one unbroken mass stretching across northern Germany seemed to secure them from Catholic attack. But the Calvinistic states, Hesse, Baden, and the Palatinate, felt none of this security. If the treaty were strictly construed it gave them no right of existence, for Calvinism had arisen since the treaty was signed. Their position, too, was a hazardous one. They lay girt in on all sides but one by Catholic territories: here by the bishops of the Rhineland, with the Spaniards in Franche Comté, and the Netherlands to back them; there by Bavaria and by the bishoprics of the Main. Foes such as these, indeed, the Calvinists could fairly have faced; but behind them lay the house of Austria; and the influence of the Catholic revival was at last telling on the Austrian princes. In 1606 an attempt of the Emperor Rudolf to force Catholicism again on his people woke revolt in the duchy; and though the troubles were allayed by his removal, his successor, Matthias, persevered, though more quietly, in the same anti-Protestant policy.

987. The accession of the house of Austria to the number of their foes created a panic among the Calvinistic states, and in 1608 they joined together in a Protestant union with Christian of Anhalt at its head. But zeal was at once met by zeal; and the

formation of the union was answered by the formation of a Catholic league among the states about it under Maximilian, the Duke of Bavaria. Both were ostensibly for defensive purposes; but the peace of Europe was at once shaken. Ambitious schemes woke up in every quarter. Spain saw the chance of securing a road along western Germany which would enable her to bring her whole force to bear on the rebels in the Low Countries. France, on the other hand, had recovered from the exhaustion of her own religious wars, and was eager to take up again the policy pursued by Francis the First and his son, of weakening and despoiling Germany by feeding and using religious strife across the Rhine. In 1610 a quarrel over Cleves afforded a chance for her intervention, and it was only an assassin's dagger that prevented Henry the Fourth from doing that which Richelieu was to do. England alone could hinder a second outbreak of the wars of religion; but the first step in such a policy must be a reconciliation between king and parliament. James might hector about the might of the crown, but he had no power of acting with effect abroad save through the national good-will. Without troops and without supplies, his threat of war would be ridiculous; and without the backing of such a threat Cecil knew well that mediation would be a mere delusion. Whether for the conduct of affairs at home or abroad, it was needful to bring the widening quarrel between the king and the parliament to a close; and it was with a settled purpose of reconciliation that Cecil brought James to call the houses again together in 1610.

988. He never dreamed of conciliating the commons by yielding unconditionally to their demands. Cecil looked on the right to levy impositions as legally established; and the Tudor sovereigns had been as keen as James himself in seizing on any rights that the law could be made to give them. But as a practical statesman he saw that the right could only be exercised to the profit of the crown if it was exercised with the good-will of the people. To win that good-will it was necessary to put the impositions on a legal footing; while for the conduct of affairs it was necessary to raise permanently the revenue of the crown. On the Tudor theory of politics these were concessions made by the nation to the king; and it was the Tudor practice to buy such concessions by counter concessions made by the king to the nation. Materials for such a bargain existed in the feudal rights of the crown, above all those of marriage and wardship, which were harassing to the people while they brought little profit to the exchequer. The commons had more than once prayed for some commutation of these rights, and Cecil seized on their prayer as the ground of an accommodation. He proposed that James should waive his feudal rights, that he should submit to the sanction by parliament of the impositions already levied, and that he should bind himself to levy no more by his own prerogative, on condition that the commons assented to this arrangement, discharged the royal debt, and raised the royal revenue by a sum of £200,000 a year.

989. Such was the "great contract" with which

Cecil met the houses when they once more assembled in 1610. It was a bargain which the commons must have been strongly tempted to accept; for heavy as were its terms, it averted the great danger of arbitrary taxation, and again brought the monarchy into constitutional relations with parliament. What hindered their acceptance of it was their suspicion of James. Purveyance and the impositions were far from being the only grievance against which they came to protest; they had to complain of the increase of proclamations, the establishment of new and arbitrary courts of law, the encroachments of the spiritual jurisdiction; and consent to such a bargain, if it remedied two evils, would cut off all chance of redressing the rest. Were the treasury once full, no means remained of bringing the crown to listen to their protest against the abuses of the church, the silencing of godly ministers, the maintenance of pluralities and non-residence, the want of due training for the clergy. Nor had the commons any mind to pass in silence over the illegalities of the preceding years. Whether they were to give legal sanction to the impositions or no, they were resolute to protest against their levy without sanction of law. James forbade them to enter on the subject, but their remonstrance was none the less vigorous. "Finding that your majesty, without advice or counsel of parliament, hath lately in time of peace set both greater impositions and more in number than any of your noble ancestors did ever in time of war," they prayed "that all impositions set without the assent of parliament may be quite abolished and taken away,"

and that "a law be made to declare that all impositions set upon your people, their goods or merchandise, save only by common consent in parliament, are and shall be void." As to church grievances their demands were in the same spirit. They prayed that the deposed ministers might be suffered to preach, and that the jurisdiction of the high commission should be regulated by statute; in other words, that ecclesiastical like financial matters should be taken out of the sphere of the prerogative and be owned as lying henceforth within the cognizance of parliament.

940. It was, no doubt, the last demand that roused above all the anger of the king. As to some of the grievances, he was ready to make concessions. He had consulted the judges as to the legality of his proclamations, and the judges had pronounced them illegal. It never occurred to James to announce his withdrawal from a claim which he now knew to be wholly against law, and he kept the opinion of the judges secret; but it made him ready to include the grievance of proclamations in his bargain with the commons, if they would grant a larger subsidy. The question of the court of Wales he treated in the same temper. But on the question of the church, of church reform, or of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, he would make no concession whatever. He had just wrought his triumph over the Scottish kirk; and had succeeded, as he believed, in transferring the control of its spiritual life from the Scottish people to the crown. He was not likely to consent to any reversal of such a process in England itself. The

claim of the commons had become at last a claim that England, through its representatives in parliament, should have a part in the direction of its own religious affairs. Such a claim sprang logically from the very facts of the reformation. It was by the joint action of the crown and parliament that the actual constitution of the English church had been established; and it seemed hard to deny that the same joint action was operative for its after-reform. But it was in vain that the commons urged their claim. Elizabeth had done wisely in resisting it, for her task was to govern a half-Catholic England with a Puritan parliament; and in spite of constitutional forms the queen was a truer representative of national opinion in matters of religion than the house of commons. In her later years all had changed; and the commons who fronted her successor were as truly representative of the religious opinion of the realm as Elizabeth had been. But James saw no ground for changing the policy of the crown. The control of the church and through it of English religion lay within the sphere of his prerogative, and on this question he was resolute to make a stand. The commons were as resolute as the king. The long and intricate bargaining came on both sides to an end; and in February, 1611, the first parliament of James was dissolved.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

